

Jonathan A. Goldstein, Esq. (SBN: 225293)
WADE LAW GROUP
A Professional Corporation
262 E Main Street
Los Gatos, CA 95030
Telephone: (408) 842-1688
Facsimile: (408) 549-1612
Email: jgoldstein@wadelitigation.com

Attorneys for Defendant,
OFFICER GACAD, in his
individual capacity

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

COALITION FOR WOMEN PRISONERS; Et. Al.)

Plaintiffs,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FEDERAL
BUREAU OF PRISONS, a governmental entity;
Et. Al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 4:23-cv-04155-YGR

**DEFENDANT/CROSS-COMPLAINANT
OFFICER GACAD'S CROSS-
COMPLAINT AGAINST
DEFENDANTS/CROSS-DEFENDANTS**

OFFICER GACAD, in his individual capacity,

Defendant/Cross-Complainant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FEDERAL
BUREAU OF PRISONS, a governmental entity;
Et. Al.,

Defendants/Cross-Defendants.

CROSS-COMPLAINT

NOW COMES Defendant/Cross-Complainant, OFFICER GACAD, in his individual capacity (hereinafter referred to as “CC-OG”) and hereby cross-complaints against Defendants/Cross-Defendants, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS, a governmental entity; BUREAU OF PRISONS DIRECTOR COLETTE PETERS, in her official capacity; FCI DUBLIN WARDEN THAHESHA JUSINO, in her official capacity; OFFICER BELLHOUSE, in his individual capacity; OFFICER JONES, in his individual capacity; LIEUTENANT JONES, in her individual capacity; OFFICER LEWIS, in his individual capacity; OFFICER NUNLEY, in his individual capacity; OFFICER POOL, in his individual capacity; LIEUTENANT PUTNAM, in his individual capacity; OFFICER SERRANO, in his individual capacity; OFFICER SHIRLEY, in his individual capacity; OFFICER SMITH, in his individual capacity; and OFFICER VASQUEZ, in her individual capacity, (hereinafter collectively referred to as “Cross-Defendants”) in the above-captioned matter initiated by Plaintiffs, COALITION FOR WOMEN PRISONERS; R.B.; A.H.R.; S.L.; J.L.; J.M.; G.M.; A.S.; and L.T., individuals on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, (hereinafter collectively referred to as “Plaintiffs”) by their filing of a Unverified Complaint against CC-OG and Cross-Defendants as follows:

THE PARTIES

1. Plaintiffs, COALITION FOR WOMEN PRISONERS; R.B.; A.H.R.; S.L.; J.L.; J.M.; G.M.; A.S.; and L.T., individuals on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, as, and was at all times mentioned herein, an individual and citizen of the United States of America, resident of Los Angeles County, State of California and was also at all times mentioned herein, (hereinafter collectively referred to as “Plaintiffs”), reside in and/or otherwise are doing business in Los Angeles County, State of California.

2. Defendant/Cross-Defendant, United States of America Federal Bureau of Prisons (“CD-BOP”) is a governmental entity that operates and is in possession and control of the Federal Correctional Institute Dublin (“FCI Dublin”). FCI Dublin is a federal female low-security correctional institution with an adjacent minimum-security satellite camp located at 5701 8th Street, Dublin, California.

1 3. Defendant/Cross-Defendant, Colette Peters (“CD-CP”) is the current director of the
2 BOP and is sued in her official capacity.

3 4. Defendant/Cross-Defendant, Tahesha Jusino (“CD-TJ”) is the current Warden of FCI
4 Dublin and is sued in her official capacity.

5 5. Defendant/Cross-Defendant, Officer Bellhouse (“CD-OB”) was an officer at FCI
6 Dublin during the relevant period and is sued in his individual capacity. While performing the acts
7 and omissions that Plaintiffs allege in this complaint, Officer Bellhouse was acting within the scope
8 of his official employment, or with the BOP’s permission and consent and under color of federal law.

9 6. Defendant/Cross-Complainant, Officer Gacad (“CD-OG”) was an officer at FCI
10 Dublin during the relevant period and is sued in his individual capacity. While performing the acts
11 and omissions that Plaintiffs allege in this complaint, Officer Gacad was acting within the scope of
12 his official employment, or with the BOP’s permission and consent and under color of federal law.

13 7. Defendant/Cross-Defendant, Officer Jones (“CD-OJ”) was an officer at FCI Dublin
14 during the relevant period and is sued in his individual capacity. While performing the acts and
15 omissions that Plaintiffs allege in this complaint, Officer Jones was acting within the scope of his
16 official employment, or with the BOP’s permission and consent and under color of federal law.

17 8. Defendant/Cross-Defendant, Lieutenant Jones (“CD-LJ”) was an officer at FCI Dublin
18 during the relevant period and is sued in her individual capacity. While performing the acts and
19 omissions that Plaintiffs allege in this complaint, Lieutenant Jones was acting within the scope of her
20 official employment, or with the BOP’s permission and consent and under color of federal law.

21 9. Defendant/Cross-Defendant, Officer Lewis (“CD-OL”) was an officer at FCI Dublin
22 during the relevant period and is sued in his individual capacity. While performing the acts and
23 omissions that Plaintiffs allege in this complaint, Officer Lewis was acting within the scope of his
24 official employment, or with the BOP’s permission and consent and under color of federal law.

25 10. Defendant/Cross-Defendant, Officer Nunley (“CD-ON”) was an officer at FCI Dublin
26 during the relevant period and is sued in his individual capacity. While performing the acts and
27 omissions that Plaintiffs allege in this complaint, Officer Nunley was acting within the scope of his
28 official employment, or with the BOP’s permission and consent and under color of federal law.

11. Defendant/Cross-Defendant, Officer Serrano (“CD-OSE”) was an officer at FCI Dublin during the relevant period and is sued in his individual capacity. While performing the acts and omissions that Plaintiffs allege in this complaint, Officer Serrano was acting within the scope of his official employment, or with the BOP’s permission and consent and under color of federal law.

12. Defendant/Cross-Defendant, Officer Shirley (“CD-OSH”) was an officer at FCI Dublin during the relevant period and is sued in his individual capacity. While performing the acts and omissions that Plaintiffs allege in this complaint, Officer Shirley was acting within the scope of his official employment, or with the BOP’s permission and consent and under color of federal law.

13. Defendant/Cross-Defendant, Officer Smith (“CD-OSM”) was an officer at FCI Dublin during the relevant period and is sued in his individual capacity. While performing the acts and omissions that Plaintiffs allege in this complaint, Officer Smith was acting within the scope of his official employment, or with the BOP’s permission and consent and under color of federal law.

Defendant Officer Pool was an officer at FCI Dublin during the relevant period and is sued in his individual capacity. While performing the acts and omissions that Plaintiffs allege in this complaint, Officer Pool was acting within the scope of his official employment, or with the BOP’s permission and consent and under color of federal law.

14. Defendant/Cross-Defendant, Lieutenant Putnam (“CD-LP”) was an officer at FCI Dublin during the relevant period and is sued in his individual capacity. While performing the acts and omissions that Plaintiffs allege in this complaint, Lieutenant Putnam was acting within the scope of his official employment, or with the BOP’s permission and consent and under color of federal law.

15. Defendant/Cross-Defendant, Officer Vazquez (“CD-OV”) was an officer at FCI Dublin during the relevant period and is sued in her individual capacity. While performing the acts and omissions that Plaintiffs allege in this complaint, Officer Vazquez was acting within the scope of her official employment, or with the BOP’s permission and consent and under color of federal law.

16. CD-BOP, CD-CP, CD-TJ, CD-OB, CD-OJ, CD-LJ, CD-OL, CD-JM, CD-OSE, CD-OSH, CD-OSM, CD-LP, CD-OV, shall be hereinafter collectively referred to as “Cross-Defendants.”

17. CC-OG and Cross-Defendants shall be hereinafter collectively referred to as “Defendants” in relation to being named party Defendants in a civil action that was initiated by

1 Plaintiffs on or about August 16, 2023 when Plaintiffs filed an Unverified Complaint against
2 Defendants in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California.

3 VENUE

4 18. This complaint seeks to remedy these failures on behalf of the putative class and to
5 compensate named Plaintiffs for the immense harms they have suffered. An actual, present, and
6 justiciable controversy exists between the parties within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 2201(a).

7 19. This action involves claims arising under the United States Constitution. The Court
8 has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1332, and authority to issue a
9 declaratory judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

10 20. Venue is proper in this district under 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(4)(B) and 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e)
11 because at least one plaintiff resides in this district, one or more defendants resides in this district, and
12 a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claims occurred in this district.

13 21. Jurisdiction is conferred upon this Court to adjudicate Plaintiffs' claims against
14 Defendants pursuant to by Title 42 of the United States Code, Sections 1331 (federal question) and
15 1343(a) (civil rights). Jurisdiction is conferred for the CC-OG's crossclaims against Cross-
16 Defendants pursuant to Title 28, United States Code Section 1367(a) because they form part of the
17 same case or controversy as Plaintiffs' claims against Defendants in the instant action.

18 22. Venue lies in the Northern District of California pursuant to Title 28, United States
19 Code Section 1391(b), as the unlawful acts and practices alleged herein occurred in and around the
20 City of Dublin, County of Alameda, California, which is within this judicial district.

21 FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

22 23. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "On or about August 16, 2023, Plaintiffs filed an
23 Unverified Complaint ("Plaintiffs' Complaint") in U.S. Northern District Court of California against
24 Defendants."

25 24. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Plaintiff R.B.
26 has been incarcerated at FCI Dublin since 2013 and at all times material to this action has been
27 incarcerated in the custody and control of the BOP. Plaintiff R.B. has been sexually harassed and
28 abused while incarcerated at FCI Dublin. Plaintiff R.B. witnessed widespread sexual abuse of her

1 friends, including her cellmate, and was sexually harassed and retaliated against herself. She lives in
 2 ongoing fear of further sexual abuse from those she depends upon for her care due to the institution's
 3 ongoing failures to address rampant staff misconduct and failure to ensure Plaintiff R.B.'s
 4 safekeeping, care, and protection. Plaintiff R.B. is also a member of CCWP." "

5 25. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Plaintiff A.H.R. has been incarcerated at FCI
 6 Dublin since May 2019 and at all times material to this action has been incarcerated in the custody
 7 and control of the BOP. Plaintiff A.H.R. is a transgender man and uses he/him pronouns. Plaintiff
 8 A.H.R. has been sexually harassed and abused while incarcerated at FCI Dublin. Plaintiff A.H.R.
 9 was coerced into serving as a lookout for officers as they sexually abused incarcerated women and
 10 was himself sexually harassed and groped by BOP staff. He lives in ongoing fear of further sexual
 11 abuse from those he depends upon for his care due to the institution's ongoing failures to address
 12 rampant staff misconduct and failure to ensure Plaintiff A.H.R.'s safekeeping, care, and protection.
 13 Plaintiff A.H.R. is also a member of CCWP."

14 26. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Plaintiff S.L. has been incarcerated at FCI Dublin
 15 since 2016 and at all times material to this action has been incarcerated in the custody and control of
 16 the BOP. Plaintiff S.L. has been sexually harassed and abused while incarcerated at FCI Dublin.
 17 Plaintiff S.L. was sexually abused by an officer for months; when that officer left BOP after being
 18 confronted about his actions, he moved to another state to be near S.L.'s family. Plaintiff S.L.
 19 continues to experience retaliation and threats from BOP staff who blame her for the officer's
 20 departure. She lives in ongoing fear of further sexual abuse from those she depends upon for her care
 21 due to the institution's ongoing failures to address rampant staff misconduct and failure to ensure
 22 Plaintiff S.L.'s safekeeping, care, and protection. Plaintiff S.L. is also a member of CCWP."

23 27. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Plaintiff J.L. has been incarcerated at FCI Dublin
 24 since 2020 and at all times material to this action has been incarcerated in the custody and control of
 25 the BOP. Plaintiff J.L. has been sexually harassed and abused while incarcerated at FCI Dublin.
 26 Plaintiff J.L. endured months of abuse by an officer who supervised her in the kitchen; the officer
 27 harassed, threatened, assaulted, and raped her. She lives in ongoing fear of further sexual abuse from
 28 those she depends upon for her care due to the institution's ongoing failures to address rampant staff

1 misconduct and failure to ensure Plaintiff J.L.'s safekeeping, care, and protection. Plaintiff J.L. is
2 also a member of CCWP."

3 28. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Plaintiff J.M. has been incarcerated at FCI Dublin
4 since 2018 and at all times material to this action has been incarcerated in the custody and control of
5 the BOP. Plaintiff J.M. has been sexually harassed and abused while incarcerated at FCI Dublin.
6 Plaintiff J.M. witnessed multiple officers sexually abusing incarcerated women and was herself
7 abused by medical staff. She lives in ongoing fear of further sexual abuse from those she depends
8 upon for her care due to the institution's ongoing failures to address rampant staff misconduct and
9 failure to ensure Plaintiff J.M.'s safekeeping, care, and protection. Plaintiff J.M. is also a member of
10 CCWP."

11 29. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Plaintiff G.M. has been incarcerated at FCI Dublin
12 since 2020 and at all times material to this action has been incarcerated in the custody and control of
13 the BOP. Plaintiff G.M. has been sexually harassed and abused while incarcerated at FCI Dublin.
14 Multiple guards sexually harassed and groped her and demanded to see parts of her body. She lives
15 in ongoing fear of further sexual abuse from those she depends upon for her care due to the
16 institution's ongoing failures to address rampant staff misconduct and failure to ensure Plaintiff
17 G.M.'s safekeeping, care, and protection. Plaintiff G.M. is also a member of CCWP."

18 30. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Plaintiff A.S. has been incarcerated at FCI Dublin
19 since 2020 and at all times material to this action has been incarcerated in the custody and control of
20 the BOP. Plaintiff A.S. has been sexually harassed and abused while incarcerated at FCI Dublin.
21 Plaintiff A.S. experienced relentless harassment by multiple officers, one who required her to expose
22 her body to him and watch him masturbating, and others who retaliated against her after the officer
23 who had abused her was placed on leave. She lives in ongoing fear of further sexual abuse from
24 those she depends upon for her care due to the institution's ongoing failures to address rampant staff
25 misconduct and failure to ensure Plaintiff A.S.'s safekeeping, care, and protection."

26 31. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Plaintiff L.T. has been incarcerated at FCI Dublin
27 since 2019 and at all times material to this action has been incarcerated in the custody and control of
28 the BOP. Plaintiff L.T. has been sexually harassed and abused while incarcerated at FCI Dublin.

1 Plaintiff L.T. was harassed and groped by an officer who forced her and others to strip and dance for
 2 him and was well known for trading food and basic goods with incarcerated individuals in exchange
 3 for sexual acts. She lives in ongoing fear of further sexual abuse from those she depends upon for her
 4 care due to the institution's ongoing failures to address rampant staff misconduct and failure to ensure
 5 Plaintiff L.T.'s safekeeping, care, and protection. Plaintiff L.T. is also a member of CCWP."

6 32. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant United States of America Federal
 7 Bureau of Prisons ("BOP") is a governmental entity that operates and is in possession and control of
 8 the Federal Correctional Institute Dublin ("FCI Dublin"). FCI Dublin is a federal female low-
 9 security correctional institution with an adjacent minimum-security satellite camp located at 5701 8th
 10 Street, Dublin, California."

11 33. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Colette Peters is the current director of
 12 the BOP and is sued in her official capacity."

13 34. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Tahesha Jusino is the current Warden of
 14 FCI Dublin and is sued in her official capacity."

15 35. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Officer Bellhouse was an officer at FCI
 16 Dublin during the relevant period and is sued in his individual capacity. While performing the acts
 17 and omissions that Plaintiffs allege in this complaint, Officer Bellhouse was acting within the scope
 18 of his official employment, or with the BOP's permission and consent and under color of federal
 19 law."

20 36. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Officer Gacad was an officer at FCI
 21 Dublin during the relevant period and is sued in his individual capacity. While performing the acts
 22 and omissions that Plaintiffs allege in this complaint, Officer Gacad was acting within the scope of
 23 his official employment, or with the BOP's permission and consent and under color of federal law."

24 37. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Officer Jones was an officer at FCI
 25 Dublin during the relevant period and is sued in his individual capacity. While performing the acts
 26 and omissions that Plaintiffs allege in this complaint, Officer Jones was acting within the scope of his
 27 official employment, or with the BOP's permission and consent and under color of federal law."

28 38. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Lieutenant Jones was an officer at FCI

Dublin during the relevant period and is sued in her individual capacity. While performing the acts and omissions that Plaintiffs allege in this complaint, Lieutenant Jones was acting within the scope of her official employment, or with the BOP's permission and consent and under color of federal law."

39. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Officer Lewis was an officer at FCI Dublin during the relevant period and is sued in his individual capacity. While performing the acts and omissions that Plaintiffs allege in this complaint, Officer Lewis was acting within the scope of his official employment, or with the BOP's permission and consent and under color of federal law."

40. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Officer Nunley was an officer at FCI Dublin during the relevant period and is sued in his individual capacity. While performing the acts and omissions that Plaintiffs allege in this complaint, Officer Nunley was acting within the scope of his official employment, or with the BOP's permission and consent and under color of federal law."

41. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Officer Serrano was an officer at FCI Dublin during the relevant period and is sued in his individual capacity. While performing the acts and omissions that Plaintiffs allege in this complaint, Officer Serrano was acting within the scope of his official employment, or with the BOP's permission and consent and under color of federal law."

42. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Officer Shirley was an officer at FCI Dublin during the relevant period and is sued in his individual capacity. While performing the acts and omissions that Plaintiffs allege in this complaint, Officer Shirley was acting within the scope of his official employment, or with the BOP's permission and consent and under color of federal law."

43. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Officer Smith was an officer at FCI Dublin during the relevant period and is sued in his individual capacity. While performing the acts and omissions that Plaintiffs allege in this complaint, Officer Smith was acting within the scope of his official employment, or with the BOP's permission and consent and under color of federal law.

Defendant Officer Pool was an officer at FCI Dublin during the relevant period and is sued in his individual capacity. While performing the acts and omissions that Plaintiffs allege in this complaint, Officer Pool was acting within the scope of his official employment, or with the BOP's permission and consent and under color of federal law. Defendant Lieutenant Putnam was an officer at FCI Dublin during the relevant period and is sued in his individual capacity. While performing the acts

1 and omissions that Plaintiffs allege in this complaint, Lieutenant Putnam was acting within the scope
2 of his official employment, or with the BOP's permission and consent and under color of federal
3 law."

4 44. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Officer Vazquez was an officer at FCI
5 Dublin during the relevant period and is sued in her individual capacity. While performing the acts
6 and omissions that Plaintiffs allege in this complaint, Officer Vazquez was acting within the scope of
7 her official employment, or with the BOP's permission and consent and under color of federal law."

8 45. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "While acting and failing to act as alleged herein,
9 Defendants, and each of them, had complete custody and total control of Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs were,
10 and continue to be, dependent upon Defendants for their personal security and necessities."

11 46. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "In performing the acts and/or omissions contained
12 herein, Defendants, and each of them, acted under color of federal law, and Plaintiffs are informed
13 and believe each acted maliciously, callously, intentionally, recklessly, with gross negligence, and
14 with deliberate indifference to the rights and personal security of Plaintiffs. Each of them knew or
15 should have known that their conduct, attitudes, actions, and omissions were, and are, a threat to
16 Plaintiffs and to their constitutionally and statutorily protected rights. Despite this knowledge
17 Defendants failed to take steps to protect Plaintiffs and to ensure their constitutional rights were
18 satisfied while in the custody of Defendants."

19 47. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Individual Defendants further directly assaulted,
20 harassed, demeaned, degraded, and trafficked particular Plaintiffs as alleged herein."

21 48. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "BOP has failed to adhere to PREA regulations.
22 From inadequate training, to lack of confidential reporting mechanisms and access to outside support
23 services, to failures in administrative investigations, widespread misuse of administrative segregation,
24 and rampant staff retaliation, its actions and failures to act have created an environment that has
25 exposed, and continues to expose, the people in its custody to an unconscionable risk of sexual
26 violence."

27 49. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Sexual assault and harassment have been serious,
28 systemic problems in BOP facilities generally—and at FCI Dublin in particular—for decades.

1 Defendants BOP and FCI Dublin officials have been aware of these problems and have failed to take
2 action.”

3 50. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Officers at FCI Dublin have been undeterred by the
4 internal investigations, criminal prosecutions, and even convictions of former staff members. Even
5 after Warden Garcia was removed from his position and the first Dublin officers were criminally
6 charged the summer of 2021, rampant sexual abuse has continued at FCI Dublin, grievously injuring
7 named plaintiffs and many others. On information and belief, officers at FCI Dublin continue to be
8 placed on administrative leave pending investigation of allegations of sexual misconduct, including
9 as recently as August 10, 2023. Plaintiffs, and other putative class members continue to report
10 ongoing sexual assault and harassment by staff.”

11 51. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Plaintiff J.L. is one of countless people who were
12 sexually abused by officers working in the kitchen, including well after Warden Garcia was
13 suspended. Plaintiff J.L. was forcibly raped, assaulted, and harassed by her kitchen supervisor,
14 Defendant Officer Jones.”

15 52. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Around July 2021, Defendant Officer Jones began
16 to taunt Plaintiff J.L. because of her weight, calling her “big,” then he began to flirt with her. Jones
17 provided Plaintiff J.L. special benefits for this sexual attention: he allowed her to have food from the
18 kitchen and allowed her to use the kitchen to cook. He also brought Plaintiff J.L. special treats from
19 the outside, like chips, chocolate bars, and ice cream which he would leave in the freezer for her.”

20 53. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “As time went on, Defendant Officer Jones’
21 behavior became assaultive. One day, he asked Plaintiff J.L. to go into the walk-in fridge to get him
22 something for his meal. Kitchen officers routinely used the walk-in fridge to abuse incarcerated
23 women, because it was private and out of view of security cameras. Once inside the fridge, Jones
24 grabbed Plaintiff J.L., bent her over, and rubbed his penis against her buttocks over their clothing. A
25 few days later, he removed her from her unit and ordered her to get his parmesan cheese out of the
26 walk-in freezer. When they entered the freezer, he tried to kiss her, but she told him she ate tuna to
27 avoid kissing him. Instead of kissing her, he pulled up her shirt, groped her, and sucked on her right
28 breast with his mouth. She was afraid to do anything to stop him. He stopped when he thought he

1 heard someone coming.”

2 54. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “The next day, Plaintiff J.L. attempted to leave
3 work, but Defendant Officer Jones instructed her to wait. He took Plaintiff J.L. into the warehouse,
4 where they entered a smaller room with a door—another location known to be out of view of security
5 cameras. Jones pulled down her pants, bent her over, and vaginally raped her without a condom,
6 pushing into her so hard that her head repeatedly hit the concrete wall in front of them. When he was
7 about to orgasm, he turned Plaintiff J.L. around and ejaculated into her mouth and onto her shirt.”

8 55. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “While this was happening, Defendant Officer Pool
9 was in the staff office in the kitchen about forty feet from the warehouse. A few days after her rape,
10 Pool—who also worked in the kitchen and sexually abused numerous kitchen workers—began
11 calling Plaintiff J.L. “Becky the Slave.” Plaintiff J.L. understood “Becky” to be slang for a person
12 who performs oral intercourse.”

13 56. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Jones recently admitted to
14 sexually assaulting five incarcerated women—including Plaintiff J.L.—in a single year. See Plea
15 Agreement at 4, United States v. Jones, No. 4:23-cr-00212-HSG (N.D. Cal. July 13, 2023).”

16 57. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Plaintiff G.M. endured horrendous sexual
17 harassment and abuse by Defendant Officers Smith and Nunley.”

18 58. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Nunley supervised Plaintiff
19 G.M. at Unicor—the for-profit call center that operates inside FCI Dublin—from approximately
20 September 2020 until September 2021. Several months after Plaintiff G.M. started working at the
21 call center, Defendant Officer Nunley began throwing notes at her instructing her to meet him in the
22 back. He would tell Plaintiff G.M. that he wanted to have sex with her and promised to write her
23 letters of recommendation and send money to her kids in exchange. On one occasion, Defendant
24 Officer Nunley took papers from Plaintiff G.M.’s desk and said he would only return them if she had
25 sex with him. When she refused, he shredded the papers.”

26 59. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “While Plaintiff G.M. was at her workstation, in
27 view of others, Defendant Officer Nunley often would come up behind her, pull her hair, rub her
28 shoulders, and attempt to kiss her. On one occasion in the spring of 2021, while showing G.M.

1 pictures of himself at a football game on his computer, Nunley came up behind her, rubbed his penis
2 against her backside and attempted to kiss her neck.”

3 60. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Plaintiff G.M. was also abused by Defendant
4 Officer Smith. When Plaintiff G.M. was in the quarantine unit during the summer of 2020, Smith
5 would regularly enter the showers to watch Plaintiff G.M. and other women shower. He would
6 refuse to give Plaintiff G.M. a towel unless she walked over to him naked. He would demand that
7 Plaintiff G.M. “show him something” in order to send out mail. Plaintiff G.M. also witnessed
8 Defendant Officer Smith make other incarcerated women perform sexual acts in order to access basic
9 privileges, including sending mail out.”

10 61. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Plaintiff G.M. witnessed other officers in the
11 quarantine unit use food and hygiene products as bribes in the same manner. She once witnessed
12 officers tell women that if they wanted a Kit-Kat bar they needed to “break off a piece” for the
13 officer, which meant revealing or touching themselves.”

14 62. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Plaintiff L.T. is also a survivor of Defendant
15 Officer Smith. From the time she arrived at FCI Dublin, Plaintiff L.T. was aware of Smith’s
16 reputation as a sexual abuser. She knew that he regularly flirted with and touched women in her
17 housing unit. She knew that when he worked the night shift, he would turn on the music in his office
18 and expect women to dance for him. She heard him tell other incarcerated people that he liked to see
19 “titties.” ”

20 63. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Then in June 2021, Defendant Officer Smith
21 forced Plaintiff L.T. to strip for him, and then assaulted her. As people were getting ready for bed,
22 Smith came to L.T.’s doorway. He asked her to dance for him. Plaintiff L.T. felt like she had no
23 other option because he was in charge and could make her life hard if she said no and began to dance
24 for him. While Plaintiff L.T. was dancing, Smith asked to touch her breasts. Plaintiff L.T. pulled up
25 her blouse and Smith groped her bare breasts with his hands. He then returned to his desk. Plaintiff
26 L.T. then saw another girl come down from her cell and dance for Smith in front of the officers’
27 station.”

28 64. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “After this initial incident, Defendant Officer Smith

1 began bringing his radio to the housing unit and would ask Plaintiff L.T. and other women to dance
2 for him whenever he was working the evening shift. Everyone in the facility, including the officers,
3 knew that Smith was holding these strip shows, but they did nothing to stop him. In exchange, Smith
4 would let L.T. and others have additional privileges including moving around the unit as they wanted
5 during facility-wide lock downs and quarantines, turning up the officers' MP3 music, drinking, and
6 generally creating a "party" atmosphere when he would have them dance and strip for him. It was
7 understood that they allowed L.T. and others out of their cells to do what they wanted for the
8 officers' whole shift from—2 pm until the 10 pm count—as long as they "entertained" Defendant
9 Officer Smith and the other officers. Officers Smith, Williams, Bell, and others facilitated this
10 exchange by opening the doors and allowing them to roam free while no one else could so that L.T.
11 and others could dance for them."

12 65. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Plaintiff A.S. has endured abuse and retaliation by
13 multiple Dublin officials. Defendant Officer Smith relentlessly sexually harassed Plaintiff A.S. from
14 around September 2020 through August 2021, including up to four times a week from November
15 2020 through March 2021 during a COVID lockdown."

16 66. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Officer Smith began harassing Plaintiff
17 A.S. around September 2020. He called her into his office and asked her about her time in state
18 prison. He told her that state prison was nothing like the BOP because in state prison, officials would
19 provide contraband to women incarcerated in order to obtain sexual favors, whereas at BOP officers
20 did not need to do that. Soon after this conversation, Smith began asking Plaintiff A.S. to "show him
21 something." He commented on how pretty her breasts looked and told her that he wanted to see
22 them. In exchange, he would trade her a drink from his office."

23 67. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "During a COVID lockdown around January 2021,
24 Defendant Officer Smith's abuse intensified. He would intercept Plaintiff A.S. and others on their
25 way to the shower, and demand that they take off their robes and show him their naked bodies. He
26 repeatedly threatened disciplinary action if A.S. and others did not disrobe in front of him. On one
27 occasion, he pulled back the shower curtain and watched Plaintiff A.S. shower. Also, during
28 lockdown, Defendant Officer Smith would watch Plaintiff A.S. in her cell when naked. Several

1 times, Smith locked A.S.'s cell door and refused to open it unless she disrobed for him. He also
2 threatened to issue disciplinary actions against Plaintiff A.S. and others unless they stripped for him."

3 68. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "After that lockdown ended, Defendant Officer
4 Smith began calling A.S. to his office over the intercom. One time, when she arrived at his office, he
5 was masturbating himself over his pants. He forced Plaintiff A.S. to stand in front of him, and stared
6 at her while he continued masturbating."

7 69. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "In August 2021, after the Warden was placed on
8 administrative leave, Defendant Officer Smith was again demoted to working the perimeter, where he
9 continued his harassment. While Plaintiff A.S. walked the yard during recreation, Defendant Officer
10 Smith drove by in a car and asked Plaintiff A.S. to "show me something." "

11 70. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "When Plaintiff A.S. refused Defendant Officer
12 Smith's advances, his friend, Officer Ramos, retaliated by tossing and searching her cell. Ramos also
13 took Plaintiff A.S.'s roommates' items intentionally to create conflict between them. Ramos told
14 Plaintiff A.S. that if she did not do what he said, another officer would "hit" her room again, meaning
15 search her cell without reason and take her possessions. On one occasion, Ramos escorted Plaintiff
16 A.S. to an office, and had Officer DeLuca strip search her, seemingly for no reason. Ramos and
17 DeLuca took Plaintiff A.S.'s property during this incident."

18 71. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Plaintiff S.L. has been assaulted, harassed, and
19 stalked by Defendant Officer Lawrence Gacad. Gacad's abuse began in March 2022, nearly a year
20 after the Warden was placed on administrative leave. Gacad began flirting with Plaintiff S.L. and
21 dedicating songs to her that he played on his computer. He dropped her notes in her cell during
22 rounds, telling her that she was beautiful, that he was in love with her. His messages explained his
23 infatuation with Plaintiff S.L. saying, "Back in September 2021, since I first laid eyes on you, I knew
24 you were going to be my future wife." He also began sending her electronic messages using a
25 pseudonym. He gave Plaintiff S.L. gifts including a necklace, watch, and earrings."

26 72. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "After several weeks, their relationship became
27 sexual. Around April 2022, Defendant Officer Gacad grabbed Plaintiff S.L. while she was working
28 in the yard office and groped her buttocks and kissed her. Soon after, during a trash run, he pulled

1 Plaintiff S.L. into the yard office, groped her body, and kissed her. After this incident, he began to
2 grope and kiss her every time they took out the trash, approximately once a week. In May 2022,
3 Defendant Officer Gacad was working in Plaintiff S.L.'s housing unit at night when he appeared in
4 the doorway to her room. She was naked, having just come from the shower, and he kissed her and
5 touched her genitals. On one last occasion around May 2022, while Defendant Officer Gacad was
6 working in the officers' station in her unit, he again kissed Plaintiff S.L."

7 73. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "In June 2022, after another incarcerated person
8 reported Gacad's abuse, Plaintiff S.L. and Defendant Officer Gacad were questioned about their
9 rumored relationship by Defendant SIS Officer Lt. Putnam. Defendant Officer Gacad promptly
10 quit."

11 74. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "After he quit, Defendant Officer Gacad continued
12 to harass, stalk, and torment Plaintiff S.L. After she was released from the SHU, Plaintiff S.L.
13 continued to receive messages from Defendant Officer Gacad on CorrLinks for months. In the
14 beginning of July 2022, Plaintiff S.L. was shocked to see Defendant Officer Gacad in her parents'
15 home in Arizona during a video visit wearing a mask. Defendant Officer Gacad told S.L.'s parents
16 that he loved her and stayed with them for several weeks. He has since moved to Phoenix, and now
17 works with Plaintiff S.L.'s mother at the VA hospital."

18 75. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Though Plaintiff S.L. ended their relationship and
19 told Defendant Officer Gacad to stay away from her, as of Spring of 2023, she believes he is still in
20 communication with her family. Plaintiff S.L. is now terrified of being transferred to a facility in
21 Phoenix or returning to her home, where her abuser resides."

22 76. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Plaintiff A.H.R. has been sexually harassed and
23 retaliated against by multiple officers at FCI Dublin. Throughout 2020 and 2021, Plaintiff A.H.R.
24 was forced to act as a lookout by Defendant Officer Jones in the kitchen and Defendant Officer
25 Bellhouse in the Safety Office, while the officers had sex with incarcerated women."

26 77. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "In early 2020, Plaintiff A.H.R. took a job in the
27 food service department as a butcher and shortly thereafter, Defendant Officer Jones began to flirt
28

1 with several of the girls that worked with Plaintiff A.H.R. Soon after, he began ordering Plaintiff
2 A.H.R. to work as a look out for him while he had sex with incarcerated women.”

3 78. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Jones made it clear that Plaintiff
4 A.H.R. could have anything he wanted from the kitchen, such as cheese and vegetables, in exchange
5 for his work as a lookout.”

6 79. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Being forced into this lookout role made Plaintiff
7 A.H.R. deeply uncomfortable. He quit his position in food service to try to avoid taking part in
8 Defendant Officer Jones’s abuse.”

9 80. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Soon after, when Plaintiff A.H.R. began working
10 in a new job in the Safety Department, he was once again forced to act as a lookout for Defendant
11 Officer Bellhouse. Bellhouse forced Plaintiff A.H.R. to work as a lookout as Bellhouse had sex with
12 the women that A.H.R. worked with. Plaintiff A.H.R. worked as a lookout until Bellhouse was
13 walked off the job for his inappropriate sexual relationships.”

14 81. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “In exchange for working as a lookout, Defendant
15 Officer Bellhouse gave Plaintiff A.H.R. food such as pizza, bagels, candy, and energy drinks such as
16 Monsters and Red Bulls. Plaintiff A.H.R. knew that this was a way to ensure he would help the
17 officers and stay quiet. Plaintiff A.H.R. believes that these officers targeted him to work as a lookout
18 because he is a transgender man, and they believed that it would not raise suspicion if they had a man
19 working with them.”

20 82. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “From around July to November 2022, Plaintiff
21 A.H.R. was himself sexually harassed by Defendant Officer Vazquez. Vazquez would often remove
22 A.H.R. from his living area or workplace. Defendant Officer Serrano often assisted Defendant
23 Officer Vazquez to take Plaintiff A.H.R. to private rooms where it was well known that there were no
24 cameras. Once there, Vazquez would flirt with A.H.R. and often asked why he didn’t look for
25 women “beyond the fence.” She also hugged A.H.R. on a number of occasions and kissed him on the
26 lips. For these sexual favors, Defendant Officer Vazquez brought Plaintiff A.H.R. contraband such
27 as Red Bulls, candy bars, and clothing, and gave him special privileges such as using staff
28 computers.”

83. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Officers Vazquez and Serrano began to intentionally interfere with Plaintiff A.H.R.'s romantic relationship with another incarcerated person in an attempt to separate him from his partner. Around September 6, 2022, Defendant Officers Vazquez and Serrano took him to a staff office. Serrano told him about the email messages that his incarcerated girlfriend was exchanging with Defendant Officer Gacad. Vasquez allowed A.H.R. to use her computer to view these email messages. Defendant Officers Vazquez and Serrano also let A.H.R. listen to phone calls between his incarcerated girlfriend and Defendant Officer Gacad."

84. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Shortly after Plaintiff A.H.R. filed an emergency request for administrative remedy in March 2023, Defendant Officer Vazquez was placed on administrative leave."

85. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Plaintiff J.M. witnessed Defendant Officers Jones and Pool sexually abusing incarcerated women in early 2022 and was herself abused by FCI Dublin medical staff."

86. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "In November 2021, Nurse Fraser Cohen inappropriately groped Plaintiff J.M.'s naked breast while administering an "EKG" for an unknown medical reason. At least two other incarcerated women report that Nurse Cohen forced them to disrobe and inappropriately fondled their breasts during medical exams in 2021 and 2022. In June 2022, Cohen took another incarcerated woman to the medical office multiple times a week outside of normal hours and weekends and sedated her to the point of unconsciousness for no apparent medical reason. On at least one occasion, this woman awoke and found that Nurse Cohen was fondling her bare breasts."

87. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "In July 2022, Nurse Wilson came into Plaintiff J.M.'s cell and gave her an injection that knocked her out for several hours. Staff never explained why she was given this shot, or what happened when she was unconscious, but the experience made her even more afraid to engage and seek medical care at the facility due to fears that she would be groped or otherwise drugged and assaulted."

88. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Plaintiff R.B.'s recent experiences show that people at FCI Dublin continue to endure degrading sexual comments and invasions of privacy on a

1 regular basis. Plaintiff R.B. has a medical condition that requires her to give herself rectal enemas at
2 least once per day. In order to administer the enema, she has to disrobe from the waist down.
3 Previously, she was housed alone to protect her privacy, but on November 23, 2022, Case Manager
4 O'Brien, and Unit Manager Groover told R.B. that she would be getting a roommate. Plaintiff R.B.'s
5 enema process can take up to two hours, but FCI Dublin only requires her roommate to leave for
6 twenty minutes. In addition, staff refuse to allow R.B. to cover her window while she administers the
7 enema. In March 2023, Officer Cortez went so far as to shine a flashlight on Plaintiff R.B. while she
8 was administering an enema in her room, causing her intense humiliation and fear."

9 89. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Numerous CCWP members have endured sexual
10 assault and harassment by FCI Dublin officials, even after former Warden Garcia was put on leave.
11 For example, many CCWP members were abused by members of the kitchen staff throughout 2021
12 and into 2022, including Defendant Officers Pool, O'Connor, Kinlaw, and St. Clair, who remain on
13 administrative leave pending investigation into sexual abuse allegations. Combined, these kitchen
14 officers have victimized dozens of additional putative class members at FCI Dublin—raping them,
15 groping them, harassing them, threatening them, and ordering others to assist with their abuse. These
16 officers would regularly provide the women they abused with fresh fruits, vegetables, dairy products,
17 and fish and meats in exchange for sexual favors, or to curry survivors and witnesses' silence."

18 90. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Other CCWP members have been sexually abused
19 by staff in recent months. For example, around February 2023, CCWP member A.R., was sexually
20 harassed and groped by Officer Caston while in the SHU. Caston grabbed A.R.'s breast, told officers
21 to look at A.R.s "big ass titties," denied A.R. menstrual products, and interfered with their outgoing
22 mail. In June 2023, while CCWP member T.M. was in the shower, Officer Cooper kicked open the
23 curtain and shown a flashlight on her naked body. T.M. later to spoke to multiple other women who
24 said that Cooper had also walked in on them while showering."

25 91. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Named Plaintiffs and numerous CCWP members
26 have experienced retaliation after reporting abuse by FCI Dublin staff."

27 92. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "For example, Plaintiff J.M. was placed in the SHU
28 for over two weeks in October 2022, soon after making a legal call regarding abuse at FCI Dublin.

1 During that period staff prevented her from calling her lawyer.”

2 93. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “After filing a PREA complaint and speaking with
3 an FBI officer, Plaintiff G.M. was placed in the SHU for four and a half months on a false write up.
4 Since her retaliatory SHU placement, Plaintiff G.M.’s confidential legal mail has been opened, and
5 her room has been repeatedly searched, as recently as March 2023. In addition, beginning in January
6 2023, Defendant Officer Shirley and Defendant Lt. Jones have harassed Plaintiff G.M. and other
7 incarcerated people for reporting sexual abuse. Defendant Officer Shirley asked Plaintiff G.M. if she
8 was “working for them” and going to “report me to the FBI.” ”

9 94. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Even failing to comply with demands to report
10 abuse could result in retaliation. In July 2022, Defendant SIS Lt. Putnam placed Plaintiff S.L. in the
11 SHU after she refused to speak with OIG about her relationship with Defendant Officer Gacad, who
12 had quit the month prior. Defendant Lt. Putnam further confiscated all of Plaintiff S.L.’s property,
13 and never returned it. Plaintiff S.L. believes that SIS staff still have her property, including evidence
14 of her relationship with Defendant Officer Gacad.”

15 95. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “After Plaintiff S.L. worked up the courage to report
16 Defendant Officer Gacad, she faced retaliation from other officers. Defendant Officer Serrano
17 blamed S.L. for getting another Dublin officer walked off and called S.L. “bitch” and other degrading
18 names. Serrano also removed Plaintiff S.L.’s mail from the mailbox and read it aloud to others in an
19 attempt to intimidate her from reporting. Prior to being walked off for misconduct allegations,
20 Defendant Lt. Jones also threatened Plaintiff S.L. and regularly embarrassed her in front of her entire
21 unit. Officers also spread gossip and give cruel directives about people who report sexual abuse; for
22 example, Officers Serrano and Vazquez would say to people “don’t speak to [S.L.]” as a way to
23 ensure she kept quiet.”

24 96. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “After Plaintiff A.H.R. reported Defendant Officer
25 Gacad’s abuse of Plaintiff S.L. to Defendant Lt. Putnam in November 2022, officers retaliated
26 against him by threatening him. Defendant Officer Serrano came to his door and told him, “You
27 better tell your fucking bitch to not report us.” Officers also spread rumors about his and Plaintiff
28 S.L.’s cooperation with investigations.”

1 97. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Plaintiff L.T. was afraid to report because she
2 knew that staff routinely retaliated against survivors and was aware that Defendant SIS Lt. Putnam
3 was friends with many abusive officers, including Warden Garcia. After Plaintiff L.T. spoke with the
4 U.S. Attorney's Office and filed an emergency request for an administrative remedy in March 2023,
5 officers verbally harassed and strip-searched her. As a result, she continues to be afraid to report any
6 future abuse."

7 98. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "After Plaintiff A.S. reported Defendant Officer
8 Smith's abuse to SIS around April 2023, Defendant Officer Lewis ordered Plaintiff A.S. to unzip her
9 commissary-issued sweatshirt to expose her clothed chest while leaving Food Service, something
10 female officers had never ordered her to do before. When Defendant Officer Lewis told her to keep
11 "running [her] mouth," Plaintiff A.S. reported his harassment to SIS. The same day, staff searched
12 her room in apparent retaliation. Defendant Officer Lewis has forced Plaintiff A.S. to unzip her
13 sweatshirt countless times since then."

14 99. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Plaintiff R.B. was also afraid to report staff abuse
15 because she witnessed retaliation against survivors who did report abuse, including retaliatory
16 placement in SHU. When she did eventually report former Warden Garcia's abuse, she faced
17 retaliation. Plaintiff R.B. was close friends with M.H., who confided in Plaintiff R.B. about her
18 physical relationship with Warden Garcia. Once, following an argument he had with M.H., Warden
19 Garcia came over to Plaintiff R.B. and ask if she "could keep this one calm," which R.B. understood
20 to be a request to help keep M.H. quiet about their illicit relationship. After Plaintiff R.B. was
21 subpoenaed to testify for the government against the former Warden, she lost her job in the Warden's
22 Complex suddenly and without any explanation. One day months later, after Plaintiff R.B. and others
23 returned to their unit following a legal visit, Officer Craig forced the entire unit to attend a "Town
24 Hall" meeting, during which he screamed at and berated them. R.B. and others understood this to be
25 punishment for meeting with attorneys."

26 100. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Many CCWP members have also been retaliated
27 against for reporting abuse and speaking with outside advocates. For example, after CCWP member
28 A.R. reported being sexually harassed and groped by Officer Caston in early 2023, staff kept A.R. in

the SHU for weeks for seemingly no reason, then transferred them to a far-off facility. After CCWP member T.M. reported that Officer Cooper sexually harassed her in the shower in June 2023, guards gave her a bogus write-up, searched her cell, and destroyed her property.”

101. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “CCWP member A.S. was repeatedly sexually assaulted and harassed by Officer Nunley throughout 2020 and 2021, and finally worked up the courage to share her experiences with an attorney in March 2023. Just days after her first legal call, officers took her to the SHU for weeks for “wearing green pants.” After her attorney successfully advocated for her release from the SHU, officers have continued to retaliate against her, including by searching her room countless times. CCWP member N.A. was sexually harassed and assaulted by Officer Ramos repeatedly for years, until he was walked off around March 2022. After she reported him to the Warden and the OIG, Ramos was not held accountable, and he only became more aggressive. Other staff continue to retaliate against N.A. including by harassing at her, screaming at her in front of other incarcerated women, and throwing her in the SHU as recently as March 2023. CCWP member M.S. was sexually harassed by a medical technician, who forced M.S. to disrobe unnecessarily and smacked her butt during a medical exam in May 2022. Shortly after M.S. reported the technician to SIS in June 2022, M.S. developed a sinus infection. Medical staff ignored her many requests for care, and by the time she was seen in late August, she was in constant, excruciating pain, and had to go on very intense antibiotics.”

102. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “After many Plaintiffs submitted emergency requests for administrative remedies regarding staff misconduct in February and March 2023, FCI Dublin strip searched dozens of people on their way to and from legal visits with undersigned counsel and CCWP advocates. Strip searches around legal visits were previously unheard of at FCI Dublin, and many understood this to be punishment for speaking with attorneys.”

103. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Other survivors were transferred soon after reporting their abuse and filing emergency requests, which they and others still at FCI Dublin believe was retaliation and an effort to suppress further reports. Other survivors have experienced repeated and invasive drug tests that began only after they reported abuse; SHU placement on obviously pretextual or false charges; direct threats of physical violence from officers who had been abusing

1 them; unnecessary strip searches on a near-daily basis for months after reporting; termination from
 2 their jobs; medical neglect; and being prohibited from using the phone or conducting video visits with
 3 family.”

4 104. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Even after some survivors were transferred to other
 5 facilities, retaliation resulting from reporting their abuse at Dublin continued at their new facilities.
 6 For example, after one individual was transferred to FDC SeaTac, that individual was retaliated
 7 against for having reported at FCI Dublin, including through use of force, false write-ups, barring
 8 him from using the phone, being placed in the SHU. After another survivor was transferred to FCI
 9 Phoenix, she was “marked as a ‘troublemaker’ because she was at Dublin,” was denied a job because
 10 of it, and officers at the facility further retaliated after her name was released in the news. A group of
 11 survivors and witnesses now at FPC Bryan are disparagingly referred to by staff as “the Dublin girls,”
 12 indicating they will be targeted for disfavor. Preemptive Retaliation to Prevent Reporting.”

13 105. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Survivors and witnesses of abuse also experienced
 14 threats and preemptive retaliation from officers who suspected they would report their abuse.”

15 106. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “For example, after Plaintiff J.L. told another
 16 incarcerated person about Defendant Officer Jones’ abuse, he threatened Plaintiff J.L. with physical
 17 violence. One day when J.L. went to dinner, Defendant Officer Jones pulled her to the side and told
 18 her he was going to “beat [her] ass because [h]e was pissed” that she reported the abuse. He said she
 19 needed to “keep [her] mouth shut” so that “[they]” don’t get into trouble.” ”

20 107. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Lt. Jones also repeatedly threatened to
 21 punish Plaintiff J.L, Plaintiff A.S., and others if they reported staff misconduct. Before she was
 22 placed on administrative leave in March 2023 following sexual misconduct allegations, Lt. Jones was
 23 well known for screaming at incarcerated women, blaming them for the staff walk-offs and sexual
 24 abuse, and threatening collective punishment. When she first came to Dublin, she told people
 25 incarcerated there that she was retaliating against them for the things that were being said about
 26 officers there. She told Plaintiff A.S. and her roommates: “I came here because of everything that’s
 27 going on, you can go ahead and write me up, it’s not gonna go anywhere.” ”

28 108. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “In January 2023, Defendant Lt. Jones pat searched

all the kitchen workers, including Plaintiff J.L., in front of four male officers. Defendant Lt. Jones intimidated Plaintiff J.L. and her coworkers and forced them put their food trays on the ground with geese excrement. Defendant Lt. Jones screamed at those watching, including Plaintiff A.S.: “Stop staring, you’ll be next.” She shouted things like: “You wouldn’t have to deal with staff like me if you hadn’t gotten rid of all the good ones,” and “you told on all the good ones.” Lt. Jones told Plaintiff J.L. and the other kitchen workers that she loved to send people to the SHU and told them to “make sure to write your lawyers about this,” and “when you write to your lawyers, make sure you spell my name right. It is J-O-N-E-S.” This made it clear to Plaintiff J.L. that staff read their emails and letters so that they would know who was reporting abuse and who they would target for future retaliation.”

109. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Many CCWP members have experienced preemptive retaliation. For example, Defendant Officer Smith threatened CCWP member Y.M. after she witnessed his rampant abuse. Smith harassed many women in Y.M.’s housing unit, specifically targeting Mexican immigrant women. Smith had sexual relationships with two of Y.M.’s former cellmates; he would enter the cell and order Y.M. to leave so that he could have sexual contact with her roommate. Smith told Y.M. that he knew that her son was in federal prison, and that if she reported him, her son would be hurt. Staff also used physical violence and threats to attempt to silence CCWP member Z.T.S.. After Z.T.S. walked in on Officer Chavez having sex with an incarcerated woman in the warehouse in late 2019, Chavez grabbed Z.T.S. by the shirt, shoved her against a wall, and violently shook her by her work uniform while her coworkers looked on. Defendant Officer Jones was in a sexual relationship with Z.T.S.’s cellmate, and after the relationship ended, Jones lashed out at both Z.T.S. and her cellmate. He shoved Z.T.S.’s cellmate against a hot oven, and verbally abused Z.T.S., calling her a “fucking wetback” and threatening: “I’ll slap the shit out of you if you ever say anything.” Defendant Officer Jones also instructed another incarcerated woman to “do whatever you need to do to put [Z.T.S.] in the SHU.” That woman made a false report that Z.T.S. got into a fight with her, and Z.T.S. was thrown into the SHU for a month.”

110. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Multiple noncitizen survivors and witnesses of staff abuse were threatened with deportation. Officers told them that they would contact immigration authorities if they reported staff misconduct.”

111. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Others incarcerated at FCI Dublin similarly experienced anticipatory retaliation, such as physical violence and threats of additional violence; sexual assault; verbal abuse and epithets; threats of retaliatory SHU placements; and being fired from a job because an abusive officer suspected a survivor would report him. Others were placed in the SHU in what they understood to be an effort to suppress individual reports of abuse, or a threat of "collective punishment" if they reported officers' abuse. Additionally, one officer that was abusing an individual he knew had kids threatened to cut off visits with her children if she reported him. Then-Warden Garcia threatened to transfer one woman "to a facility further away from her children" if she told any other incarcerated women of their relationship."

112. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "For example, Defendant Lt. Putnam has led internal investigations of staff misconduct at FCI Dublin for years and remains in a leadership role to this day. Throughout the time that former Warden Garcia and convicted former officials were sexually abusing people in their custody, Defendant Lt. Putnam received dozens of reports of staff abuse. Indeed, many named Plaintiffs and CCWP members reported staff abuse to Lt. Putnam in recent years. Instead of acting on those reports, Defendant Lt. Putnam would tell those who reported abuse: "You should keep quiet, do your time, and don't make problems." It was also well known that Lt. Putnam was close to Warden Garcia and other abusers."

113. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Furthermore, when incarcerated persons report abuse to staff, their experiences are often not kept confidential, and are instead shared among staff and even other incarcerated people. For example, after Plaintiff A.H.R. reported Defendant Officer Gacad's ongoing sexual abuse of Plaintiff S.L., Defendant Lt. Jones and Defendant Officer Serrano began retaliating against S.L. Lt. Jones and Officer Serrano have threatened her, embarrassed her in front of her unit, read her aloud mail to others, monitored her calls, spread rumors about her, called her a "bitch" and told others, "don't speak to [S.L.]."

114. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "All other means of communicating with the outside world—including the BOP email system, regular phone calls, and regular mail—are heavily monitored by staff. Many people at FCI Dublin report that staff read their emails and letters, and listen to their calls, and reference the contents in later conversations. For example, after CCWP

1 member M.S. wrote to an attorney stating that “abuse is still happening here,” Defendant Lt. Putnam
2 pulled her into a private room to question her about what she had shared with the attorney.”

3 115. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “After reports are made, and evidence of staff
4 misconduct is provided, action is often not swiftly taken against officers. Indeed, oftentimes, no
5 action is taken at all. As a result of this pattern of inaction and retaliation, people incarcerated at FCI
6 Dublin broadly understand that even brazen sexual abuse and harassment will not be meaningfully
7 sanctioned at FCI Dublin.”

8 116. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “For example, after Plaintiff R.B. summoned the
9 courage to report Defendant Officer O’Connor—for sexually harassing another incarcerated woman,
10 and physically threatening R.B. when she tried to intervene to three different members of the Task
11 Force—no actions were taken against him.”

12 117. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “After Plaintiff A.H.R. reported Defendant Officer
13 Gacad’s ongoing sexual misconduct in November 2022, Lt. Putnam said it was “too much” for him to
14 deal with and did not follow-up with A.H.R. until A.H.R. filed an emergency request for
15 administrative remedy in March 2023 through his attorneys.”

16 118. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “In addition, when allegations were first made about
17 Defendant Officer Gacad’s sexual relationship with Plaintiff S.L., Defendant Gacad was permitted to
18 voluntarily resign his post at FCI Dublin and remains free in the community to continue his
19 harassment of Plaintiff S.L. and her family. Plaintiff S.L.’s own report about misconduct by
20 Defendant Officer Gacad was not investigated until June 2023.”

21 119. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Plaintiff J.L. reported her abuse by Defendant
22 Officer Jones to Defendant Lt. Putnam in May 2022, and participated in an FBI interview in August
23 2022, but she received no information about the investigation or any support until she filed an
24 emergency grievance about conditions in March 2023.”

25 120. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Plaintiff G.M. reported her abuse in July 2022 and
26 spoke to the FBI in August 2022, but she did not receive any follow-up about the investigation for
27 many months, nor did she receive any support, only retaliation.”

28 121. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Plaintiff A.S. reported Defendant Officer Lewis’s

1 sexual harassment to SIS repeatedly, but no action has been taken against him.”

2 122. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “In recent months, Plaintiff L.T. has gone to SIS to
3 report Defendant Officer Smith’s abuse at least four times, SIS staff ignore her and do nothing to
4 help. Plaintiff L.T. has also tried to report issues using the forms they provide for administrative
5 remedies, but officers refuse to take them.”

6 123. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Even where multiple people have reported abuse
7 by specific officers, those officers have remained employed by BOP. For example, both Plaintiff S.L.
8 and Plaintiff A.H.R. have reported retaliation by Defendant Officer Serrano, yet the officer remains
9 on staff at FCI Dublin. Defendant Officers O’Connor and Kinlaw are still on administrative leave
10 pending criminal investigations, and as of May 2023, FCI Dublin was still accepting “bids” from
11 them for their positions in the kitchen.”

12 124. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Some survivors have reported abuse directly to
13 BOP officials overseeing FCI Dublin and still faced inaction. For example, in 2021 when one
14 incarcerated woman reported Defendant Officer Smith’s persistent harassment of her to a visiting
15 BOP representative, the representative acknowledged there were other reports on Defendant Officer
16 Smith but offered no indication that the report would be taken seriously, saying only, “It’s normal for
17 that to happen to women like you, you are pretty.” ”

18 125. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Furthermore, even in cases where officers have
19 been criminally convicted for abuse at FCI Dublin, the BOP has failed to make any reparations to
20 survivors of their abuse who remain in BOP custody. BOP has declined to certify U-Visa
21 applications to survivors who aid in internal investigations of officers and face deportation, it has
22 broadly declined to sign compassionate release petitions of survivors and testifying witnesses, and
23 there has been no apology made to survivors by the officers involved or the FCI administration that
24 permitted these egregious human rights violations to occur. It is no surprise, in this context, that
25 sexual abuse continues.”

26 126. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “As a result of the BOP’s failure to prevent officers’
27 sexual violence, survivors of sexual abuse and retaliation at FCI Dublin have suffered grievous harm,
28 with ongoing effects. The injuries inflicted upon them by abusive officers include physical pain from

1 rape, mental anguish, extreme emotional distress and resulting physical symptoms, economic
2 damages, dignitary harms profound social isolation, and undue invasion of privacy.”

3 127. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “The Plaintiffs in this case have all suffered serious
4 injuries following staff sexual abuse and retaliation at FCI Dublin. The widespread staff misconduct
5 at FCI Dublin has forced Plaintiff CCWP to divert critical resources to provide its members needed
6 support resources, engage in public advocacy efforts, and respond to members’ urgent mental and
7 physical health needs.”

8 128. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Plaintiff R.B. was recently diagnosed with
9 depression and prescribed antidepressants. Stress and anxiety have caused her hair to fall out, her to
10 lose weight, and interfered with her ability to sleep.”

11 129. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Plaintiff A.H.R. was forced to quit his job in Food
12 Service to avoid witnessing former Defendant Officer Jones’ rapes of incarcerated women. He has
13 suffered anxiety and depression and has experienced fear for his personal safety and humiliation as a
14 result of his own sexual harassment by Defendant Officer Vazquez.”

15 130. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Plaintiff S.L. has suffered extreme emotional
16 distress as a result of her abuse by Defendant Officer Gacad and retaliation by multiple Dublin
17 officials. Her chronic stress is so severe that it has disrupted her menstrual cycle.”

18 131. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Plaintiff J.L. was diagnosed with PTSD as a result
19 of her abuse by Defendant Officer Jones. For months, she slept constantly and confined herself to her
20 room because she was afraid of what officers could do.”

21 132. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Plaintiff J.M. has experienced intense anxiety,
22 depression, and insomnia. After being placed in the SHU, she was so distraught that she was placed
23 on suicide watch.”

24 133. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Plaintiff G.M. has experienced severe depression
25 and PTSD due to the abuse she witnessed and experienced. Her symptoms were exacerbated after
26 staff chose to withdraw G.M. from prescribed medication for a period of two months. She has
27 suffered a partial blindness as a result of her chronic stress.”

28 134. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Plaintiff A.S. has experienced intense anxiety,

1 which is exacerbated each time she has to interact with officers at Dublin.”

2 135. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Plaintiff L.T. has experienced anxiety, depression,
3 and insomnia, and cries constantly. F. Survivors of and Witnesses to Sexual Abuse Are Denied
4 Access to Mental Health Care and Medical Care to Address Their Mental and Physical Injuries. “

5 136. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “After suffering grievous mental and physical
6 injury, survivors continue to be denied basic mental health and medical care.”

7 137. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Survivors of sexual abuse at FCI Dublin suffered
8 and continue to suffer severe emotional distress resulting from their abuse. For example, many
9 survivors have suffered depression, suicidality, intense anxiety, panic attacks, and paranoia. Some
10 survivors who were able to get mental health care are now on psychotropic medications to treat
11 anxiety and depression or sleep disorders. Others have been unable to obtain adequate mental health
12 care, prolonging or worsening their emotional distress.”

13 138. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Many survivors live in a perpetual state of fear.
14 Some survivors are too afraid to leave their rooms, go anywhere alone or be alone anywhere in
15 custody, or shower alone for fear of being abused (beyond the reach of surveillance cameras), and
16 some feel ill at the sight of officers’ grey uniforms. For some, the officers’ sexual abuse triggered
17 their previous traumatic experiences of surviving sexual abuse or domestic violence, exacerbating
18 their emotional distress. Due to the gravity of the emotional harms and the pervasive culture of sexual
19 abuse at FCI Dublin, survivors’ emotional distress persists after they are transferred or released, or
20 their abusers have been walked off.”

21 139. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Survivors are not provided with adequate mental
22 health care at FCI Dublin to address the psychological trauma that officers’ abuse and retaliation has
23 caused. Though FCI Dublin recently re-established an agreement with an outside agency, Tri-Valley
24 Haven, to provide legally required mental health services to survivors of sexual abuse at the facility,
25 these services were not available at the facility for over a year. Even now, there is no direct way for
26 survivors to confidentially contact the outside mental health agency, Tri-Valley Haven, to request
27 mental health services. Survivors must either put in a request to Tri-Valley Haven, or use the new
28 pilot legal phones, which can often only be accessed with staff assistance. Even once contacted, very

1 few survivors at FCI Dublin have been able to see a counselor from Tri-Valley Haven in-person or
2 able to speak with them on a confidential line. Those lucky few are only permitted five thirty-minute
3 sessions with unlicensed counselors. Survivors of abuse at Dublin who BOP subsequently transferred
4 to other facilities do not have any access to outside specialized support services from Tri-Valley
5 Haven or other analogous organizations.”

6 140. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “For example, despite requesting services from Tri-
7 Valley Haven multiple times, it took months for Plaintiff S.L. and Plaintiff G.M. to receive care.
8 Plaintiff S.L. was dismayed that she had to repeat her trauma to a new counselor at each session.
9 Meanwhile, Plaintiff R.B. and others who have requested to meet with Tri-Valley Staff have been
10 told that the list is “full.” ”

11 141. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “This obstructionism compounds the problem that
12 many people incarcerated at FCI Dublin do not trust the mental health professionals that work at the
13 prison and do not feel safe talking with them; they know that information they share related to their
14 traumatic experiences with sexual assault and harassment do not stay confidential. For example,
15 Plaintiff L.T. was retaliated against after she spoke to her attorneys and the BOP psychologist. After
16 she spoke to them, she was moved out of her unit in retaliation. When L.T. inquired as to why she
17 was moved, her unit manager, Officer Craig, told her it was because of “all the lies you guys are
18 telling, you guys are going to psychology and telling lies about PREA.” Officer Craig is married to
19 the psychologist who L.T. reported to, Dr. Mulcahy. Plaintiff L.T. knew that Officer Craig’s
20 comments meant that he had discussions with his wife about what she reported when she attempted to
21 access mental health care. As a result, L.T. is afraid of accessing any mental health care in the
22 facility or reporting what she experienced.”

23 142. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Even where survivors have felt safe to seek mental
24 health care at FCI Dublin, many either cannot actually access the care or it is severely inadequate.
25 For example, facility staff told Plaintiff G.M. to just “do breathing exercises” after she was abused by
26 two officers. When another survivor sought mental health care at the direction of SIS in 2021, none
27 of the therapists she met with spoke Spanish, her primary language, so they were unable to assist
28 her.”

1 143. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Recently, FCI Dublin has gone so far as to cut off
2 numerous survivors' psychiatric medications. For example, around December 2022, clinicians at FCI
3 Dublin took Plaintiff G.M. off her psychiatric medications for three months. This practice is
4 widespread, disabling, and dangerous: several survivors who were taken off of mood stabilizing
5 medications after reporting abuse have been on suicide watch at Dublin in recent months."

6 144. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Further, individuals who have testified in criminal
7 cases concerning abuse at FCI Dublin have experienced extreme difficulty accessing victim-witness
8 advocates appointed to them by the U.S. Attorney's Office. After months of struggling to
9 communicate with clients, the Family Violence Law Center, one of the agencies contracted to
10 provide services to victims and witnesses in the criminal proceedings, wrote to BOP officials
11 pleading for improved access. As a result of these challenges, survivors who have been summoned to
12 share their painful experiences in court, and who have anxiously prepared to testify, are left to
13 decompensate without access to any mental healthcare."

14 145. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Survivors have experienced many physical
15 symptoms of emotional distress, including insomnia, loss of a menstrual cycle, partial vision loss,
16 hair loss, and weight loss. Accessing medical care to address these concerns is next to impossible, in
17 part due to lack of resources. People at FCI Dublin have to wait weeks or months to see a medical
18 provider if they are even able to see one at all. Problems around medical neglect are especially acute
19 for survivors' reproductive health issues."

20 146. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Multiple medical providers at FCI Dublin have
21 abused individuals in their care, which has deterred others from seeking care or going back for
22 additional care. Many people incarcerated at FCI Dublin have also been denied access to basic
23 medical care after reporting sexual abuse. Medical staff also frequently do not keep patients' health
24 information private and discuss patients' medical issues in the presence of other staff and
25 incarcerated persons."

26 147. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "For example, Plaintiff S.L. reported that she sliced
27 her finger in May 2023, but was not able to get stitches until the following day; she now has
28 permanent nerve damage. She is also afraid to seek medical care for a gynecological problem

1 because she fears that the officers who escort her to the appointment will spread rumors about her.”

2 148. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Plaintiff R.B. required an ultrasound of her breast
3 according to a medical doctor. When the time for her appointment came, there was no doctor at FCI
4 Dublin, and they figured out the order was accidentally written for the wrong breast. Without a
5 physician at the facility, Dublin staff could not change the order, so they did the ultrasound on the
6 wrong breast. Plaintiff R.B. is still waiting on the facility to send her out for an ultrasound on the
7 correct breast.”

8 149. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Prior to being incarcerated, Plaintiff G.M. had a
9 splenectomy in 2017. When she arrived at FCI Dublin, she was taken off her blood-clotting
10 medicine. Compounded by her extreme distress following staff sexual abuse, she is now starting to
11 go blind as a result. Since February, she has been losing vision in her eye, and it was several months
12 before she could see an eye specialist. Her vision loss episodes have been getting more frequent and
13 are now accompanied by headaches; she has also fallen off the bed multiple times because of her
14 vision loss and she has bruises all over her body. Every time she goes to sick call, they have no
15 record of her problems. When she has inquired about her care, staff asked what her “motive” is and
16 whether she is going to file a grievance against them.”

17 150. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Plaintiff A.H.R. pulled a muscle in his back and
18 was experiencing significant pain; clinicians refused to give him ibuprofen to treat it. He also
19 suffered a weeks-long respiratory illness that caused him to spit up blood and feel as though he could
20 not breathe, but medical staff at FCI Dublin did nothing to treat it.”

21 151. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Plaintiff L.T has been unable to access all
22 necessary care for her respiratory condition or her hearing loss and has been provided expired
23 medication. 207. Numerous CCWP members report egregious medical neglect. For example, after
24 reporting sexual harassment by a medical technician, one CCWP member was denied care for her
25 sinus infection for over two months. Facility staff have denied another CCWP member’s repeated
26 requests to remove her IUD, which was inserted over a decade ago and must be removed.”

27 152. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “FCI Dublin Officers and their supervisors have
28 created an intricate trafficking system where incarcerated people are forced to commit sexual acts in

1 exchange for valuable items and special benefits or force incarcerated people to work as lookouts so
2 that officers may engage in their abuse. 216. As detailed in the individualized accounts of harm of
3 S.L., L.T., G.M., A.H.R. and A.S., it is common practice for officers to illicit sexual favors in
4 exchange for contraband or other benefits. Of the named plaintiffs, more than half were solicited into
5 a sex trafficking or labor trafficking system where sexual favors were exchanged for goods or
6 benefits.”

7 153. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Officers solicit sexual favors such as oral and
8 penetrative sex, digital penetration, stripping, fondling, forced sex with other incarcerated people, and
9 forced masturbation.”

10 154. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Officers take advantage of the isolation of
11 incarcerated people to solicit sexual acts from them, often forcing them to endure sexually explicit
12 comments about their bodies or manipulating them with gestures of love and adoration through notes,
13 songs, or direct comments.”

14 155. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Officers at every level have knowingly created and
15 maintained a complex system of payment for these sexual acts. The dire living conditions at FCI
16 Dublin create a context where basic necessities, hot or fresh food, sanitary items, and commissary
17 items are extremely valuable goods that officers use as bartering tools in exchange for sexual favors.
18 At times, they even exchange illicit substances, such as drugs and alcohol, for sexual acts.”

19 156. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Officers also take advantage of the lack of
20 resources and programming at FCI Dublin, to aid their payment system. They offer special benefits
21 that incarcerated people could not access otherwise in exchange for sexual acts, such as access to
22 cellphones, use of staff computers, disciplinary benefits, letters of recommendation, and offers to help
23 incarcerated people—either monetarily, or with access to reentry resources—when they are released.
24 Such rewards were specifically offered to plaintiffs G.M., A.S., S.L. and others.”

25 157. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Officers knowingly use their power and authority
26 to force, threaten and coerce incarcerated people into committing sex acts. Because officers have the
27 authority to direct incarcerated people’s actions and movements—whether as work supervisors or as
28 unit officers— Dublin officers exploit this authority to direct people into areas where they can be

1 alone in order to command incarcerated people to sexually gratify them. Officers also withhold basic
2 necessities or repeatedly lock people into their cells until they provide them with sexual favors.”

3 158. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Officers employ a cycle of retaliation to coerce
4 incarcerated people into their trafficking system and prevent reporting. Officers terrorize incarcerated
5 people with threats of physical or sexual abuse, disciplinary actions, and legal consequences if they
6 do not commit sexual acts or if they report abuse. For example, incarcerated people who are
7 noncitizens are threatened with immigration consequences if they do not commit sex acts or if they
8 report abuse.”

9 159. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Other incarcerated people are threatened with
10 disciplinary actions such as disciplinary reports, punitive cell searches, loss of job assignments, and
11 solitary confinement if they refuse sexual advances. As such, officers’ unlimited discretion to control
12 incarcerated people physically and through threatened legal process, coalesce into coercive tactics
13 that force incarcerated people into their sex trafficking system.”

14 160. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “This trafficking system is a coordinated venture,
15 where officers actively assist other perpetrating officers in exploiting incarcerated people within FCI
16 Dublin walls. Officers help perpetrating officers by assisting them to isolate and transport
17 incarcerated people to areas where perpetrating officers can receive sexual favors. Other officers
18 support perpetrating officers by failing to report sexual abuse that they are aware of, and even go so
19 far as to joke or taunt incarcerated people who they know are involved in their sex trafficking
20 system.”

21 161. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “FCI Dublin officers have created a network of
22 protection where officers act as lookouts themselves or use the forced labor of other incarcerated
23 people to act as lookouts while they receive sexual gratification. These lookouts keep watch to
24 ensure other officers or incarcerated people do not walk by areas where perpetrating officers are
25 engaging in sexual acts to prevent being caught. Officers coerce incarcerated people to perform
26 forced labor using their status as supervising officers who can issue disciplinary actions, order work
27 assignments, or dictate incarcerated people’s movements to force them to work as lookouts against
28 their will. In exchange, officers once again provide valuable goods to pay them for their forced labor

1 including outside food, drinks, commissary items, or special benefits.”

2 162. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “This system of trafficking, assault, harassment, and
3 obstruction resulted in serious harms to named plaintiffs and others incarcerated at FCI Dublin.”

4 163. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “In particular, Plaintiffs A.S., G.M., L.T., A.H.R.,
5 and S.L. were all coerced into performing particular sex acts in exchange for special benefits or items
6 of value.”

7 164. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Additionally, Plaintiffs such as A.H.R. were
8 coerced into performing forced labor for officers’ benefit such as acting as a “lookout” while the
9 officers engaged in sexual abuse.”

10 165. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “L.T. and others were further coerced into
11 performing other forced labor such as stripping for officers in staged strip shows.”

12 166. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Officers obstruct internal, criminal, or legislative
13 investigations of the sex trafficking and abuse by officers. Many FCI Dublin officers have been
14 charged with making false statements to investigators in government agencies tasked with
15 investigating claims of abuse, including the Department of Justice Office of Inspector General (OIG)
16 and the FBI. They have also committed perjury while testifying in their criminal charges and lied
17 about the abuse they committed in attempts to cover up their abuse. Officers intimidate trafficking
18 survivors and witnesses of abuse by threatening to beat incarcerated people, throw them in solitary
19 confinement.”

20 167. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendants have a non-delegable duty to ensure
21 that the conditions of confinement in facilities operated by BOP employees and contractors are
22 constitutionally adequate.”

23 168. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendants failed to adequately monitor, oversee,
24 and administer FCI Dublin and violated Plaintiffs’ rights to be free from cruel and unusual
25 punishment while they were incarcerated at FCI Dublin by subjecting them to, or failing to prevent,
26 sexual assaults, intimidation, physical, sexual and verbal abuse, threats of violence, sexual
27 harassment, retaliation, and other violations of law against Plaintiffs, and by failing to investigate
28 such violations, as set forth herein, subjected Plaintiff to unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain

1 and physical injury and continue to subject Plaintiffs to a significant risk of serious harm. This abuse
 2 occurred under coercive circumstances and by intentionally subjecting Plaintiffs to these acts,
 3 Defendants acted maliciously, in a manner that is deeply offensive to human dignity and void of
 4 penological justification.”

5 169. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Additionally, in acting and failing to act as alleged
 6 herein, Defendants subject Plaintiffs to unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain and injury and
 7 continue to subject Plaintiffs to a significant risk of serious harm by failing to properly evaluate,
 8 train, discipline, and supervise custody personnel to prevent physical harm to, and/or sexual
 9 harassment of, incarcerated persons; by failing to investigate allegations of physical harm to and/or
 10 sexual harassment of incarcerated persons; and by failing to prevent retaliation against incarcerated
 11 persons for complaints of such abuse.”

12 170. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendants’ failures, as described herein, and those
 13 of their agents, officials, employees, and all persons acting in concert with them, and are the
 14 proximate cause of the Plaintiffs’ ongoing deprivation of rights secured by the United States
 15 Constitution under the Eighth Amendment. WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment against
 16 Defendants as set forth below.

17 SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

18 (Fifth Amendment, Substantive Due Process) (Injunctive Relief Only)

19 Against Defendant BOP and All Official Capacity Defendants”

20 171. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Plaintiffs
 21 incorporate by this reference the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully
 22 herein.” ”

23 172. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendants have a non-delegable duty to ensure
 24 that the conditions of confinement in facilities operated by BOP employees and contractors are
 25 constitutionally adequate.”

26 173. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “In acting and failing to act as alleged herein,
 27 Defendants violated Plaintiffs’ right to personal security, subjecting Plaintiffs to unnecessary and
 28 wanton infliction of serious pain and injury and to a significant risk of serious harm in violation of

1 their substantive due process rights under the Fifth Amendment.”

2 174. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendants have been and are aware of all the
3 deprivations complained of herein and have condoned or been deliberately indifferent to such
4 conduct.”

5 175. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendants’ failures, as described herein, and those
6 of their agents, officials, employees, and all persons acting in concert with them, and are the
7 proximate cause of the Plaintiffs’ ongoing deprivation of rights secured by the United States
8 Constitution under the Fifth Amendment.”

9 176. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Plaintiffs incorporate by this reference the
10 allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.”

11 177. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendants have a non-delegable duty to ensure
12 that the conditions of confinement in facilities operated by BOP employees and contractors are
13 constitutionally adequate.”

14 178. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “In acting and failing to act as alleged herein,
15 Defendants subjected Plaintiffs to sexual assaults, abuse, and harassment, and/or failed to adequately
16 investigate and take reasonable measures to protect Plaintiffs, as described herein, in retaliation for
17 Plaintiffs’ complaints to prison authorities regarding such unlawful conduct.”

18 179. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendants have been and are aware of the
19 retaliation complained of herein and have condoned or been deliberately indifferent to such conduct.”

20 180. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendants’ failures, as described herein, and those
21 of their agents, officials, employees, and all persons acting in concert with them, and are the
22 proximate cause of the Plaintiffs’ ongoing deprivation of rights secured by the United States
23 Constitution under the First Amendment.”

24 181. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Plaintiff incorporates by this reference the
25 allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs as if set forth fully herein.”

26 182. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officers Nunley and Smith subjected
27 G.M. to serious bodily harm as defined by the Eight Amendment when they sexually assaulted and
28 harassed G.M. and provided or withheld privileges to coerce sexual favors from G.M.”

1 183. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Lt. Putnam was deliberately indifferent
2 to the substantial likelihood of serious harm to G.M. Despite knowledge, Defendant Lt. Putnam did
3 nothing to prevent the alleged sexual misconduct and, after G.M. reported such misconduct to
4 Defendant Lt. Putnam, she was retaliated against."

5 184. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendants' actions and failures described here
6 caused the Plaintiff's physical, emotional, and constitutional harms, and she has a claim for damages
7 for such violations under ongoing deprivation of rights secured by the United States Constitution
8 under the Eighth Amendment."

9 185. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "This claim for damages is cognizable under Bivens
10 v. Six Unknown Named Agents, 403 U.S. 388 (1971) because it claims the same harm and injury as
11 recognized in Carlson v. Green 446 U.S. 14 (1980) and Farmer v. Brennan 511 U.S. 825 (1994), two
12 recognized Bivens contexts."

13 186. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Officer Gacad subjected S.L. to cruel
14 and unusual as defined by the Eight Amendment when he sexually touched, assaulted, and harassed
15 S.L. and provided or withheld privileges to coerce sexual favors from S.L.."

16 187. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Lt. Putnam was deliberately indifferent
17 to the substantial likelihood of serious harm to S.L. Despite knowledge, Defendant Lt. Putnam did
18 nothing to prevent the alleged sexual misconduct."

19 188. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendants' actions and failures described here
20 caused the Plaintiff's physical, emotional, and constitutional harms, and she has a claim for damages
21 for such violations under ongoing deprivation of rights secured by the United States Constitution
22 under the Eighth Amendment."

23 189. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "This claim for damages is cognizable under Bivens
24 v. Six Unknown Named Agents, 403 U.S. 388 (1971) because it claims the same harm and injury as
25 recognized in Carlson v. Case 4 Green 446 U.S. 14 (1980) and Farmer v. Brennan 511 U.S. 825
26 (1994), two recognized Bivens contexts."

27 190. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Officer Jones subjected J.L. to serious
28 bodily harm as defined by the Eight Amendment he sexually assaulted, coerced sexual favors from,

1 and threatened to punish S.L. unless she provided sexual favors.”

2 191. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Pool and Defendant Lieutenant
3 Putnam were deliberately indifferent to the substantial likelihood of serious harm to J.L.. They both
4 knew of ongoing and likely assaults of J.L. and did nothing to investigate or prevent such harm.”

5 192. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendants’ actions and failures described here
6 caused the Plaintiff’s physical, emotional, an constitutional harms, and she has a claim for damages
7 for such violations under ongoing deprivation of rights secured by the United States Constitution
8 under the Eighth Amendment.”

9 193. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “This claim for damages is cognizable under *Bivens*
10 *v. Six Unknown Named Agents*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971) because it claims the same harm and injury as
11 recognized in *Carlson v. Green* 446 U.S. 14 (1980) and *Farmer v. Brennan* 511 U.S. 825 (1994), two
12 recognized *Bivens* contexts.”

13 194. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “The exploitation of vulnerable people is so
14 common that Congress has passed the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (“TVPA”), 18 U.S.C. §
15 1581 et. seq., a comprehensive statutory framework imposing both criminal and civil liability, see 18
16 U.S.C. § 1595, of persons engaging or attempting to engage or benefit from sexual exploitation and
17 labor trafficking or obstructing anti-trafficking enforcement.”

18 195. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Specifically, the TVPA punishes anyone who
19 attempts to, conspires to, or actively “recruits, entices, harbors, transports, provides, obtains,
20 advertises, maintains, patronizes, or solicits by any means a person; or . . . benefits, financially or by
21 receiving anything of value, from participation in a [trafficking] venture” while knowing “that means
22 of force, threats of force, fraud, coercion . . . will be used to cause the person to engage in a
23 commercial sex act.” 18 U.S.C. § 1591(a); 18 U.S.C. § 1594.”

24 196. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “ “Coercion” means “threats of serious harm to or
25 physical restraint against any person . . . any scheme, plan, or pattern intended to cause a person to
26 believe that failure to perform an act would result in serious harm to or physical restraint against any
27 person” or “the abuse or threatened abuse of law or the legal process.” 18 U.S.C. § 1591(e)(2).”

28 197. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “ “Serious harm” means “any harm, whether

1 physical or nonphysical, including psychological, financial, or reputational harm, that is
2 sufficiently serious, under all the surrounding circumstances, to compel a reasonable person of the
3 same background and in the same circumstances to perform or to continue performing commercial
4 sexual activity in order to avoid incurring that harm.” 18 U.S.C. § 1591(e)(5).”

5 198. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “The term “abuse or threatened abuse of law or
6 legal process” means the use or threatened use of a law or legal process, whether administrative, civil,
7 or criminal, in any manner or for any purpose for which the law was not designed, in order to exert
8 pressure on another person to cause that person to take some action or refrain from taking some
9 action. 18 U.S.C. § 1591(e)(1).”

10 199. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Commercial sex act “means any sex act, on
11 account of which anything of value is given to or received by any person.” 18 U.S.C § 1591(e)(3).”

12 200. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Additionally, the TVPA punishes anyone who
13 “knowingly provides or obtains the labor or services of a person by any one of, or by any
14 combination of, the following means. (1) by means of force, threats of force, physical restraint, or
15 threats of physical restraint to that person or another person; (2) by means of serious harm or threats
16 of serious harm to that person or another person; (3) by means of the abuse or threatened abuse of law
17 or legal process; or (4) by means of any scheme, plan, or pattern intended to cause the person to
18 believe that, if that person did not perform such labor or services, that person or another person would
19 suffer serious harm or physical restraint.” 18 U.S.C. § 1589 (a).”

20 201. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “The TVPA punishes anyone who knowingly
21 benefits, financially or by receiving anything of value, from participation in a venture which has
22 engaged in the providing or obtaining of labor or services by any of the means described in
23 subsection (a), knowing or in reckless disregard of the fact that the venture has engaged in the
24 providing or obtaining of labor or services by any of such means, shall be punished as provided in
25 subsection (d). 18 U.S.C. § 1589 (b).”

26 202. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “The term “abuse or threatened abuse of law or
27 legal process” in the forced labor provision means “the use or threatened use of a law or legal
28 process, whether administrative, civil, or criminal, in any manner or for any purpose for which the

1 law was not designed, in order to exert pressure on another person to cause that person to take some
2 action or refrain from taking some action.” 18 U.S.C. § 1589 (c)(1).”

3 203. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “The term “serious harm” means “any harm,
4 whether physical or nonphysical, including psychological, financial, or reputational harm, that is
5 sufficiently serious, under all the surrounding circumstances, to compel a reasonable person of the
6 same background and in the same circumstances to perform or to continue performing labor or
7 services in order to avoid incurring that harm.” 18 U.S.C. § 1589 (c)(12).”

8 204. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “The TVPA also punishes anyone who “obstructs,
9 attempts to obstruct, or in any way interferes with or prevents the enforcement of this section,” 18
10 U.S.C. § 1591(d). 283. The TVPA allows “[an] individual who is a victim of a violation of this
11 chapter [to] bring a civil action against the perpetrator (or whoever knowingly benefits, or attempts or
12 conspires to benefit, financially or by receiving anything of value from participation in a venture
13 which that person knew or should have known has engaged in an act in violation of this chapter) in an
14 appropriate district court of the United States and may recover damages and reasonable attorneys
15 fees.” 18 U.S.C. § 1595(a).”

16 205. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Congress grants a plaintiff up to ten years in which
17 to bring a civil action under 18 U.S.C. § 1595(c).”

18 206. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Gacad engaged or attempted to
19 engage in sex trafficking of Plaintiff S.L. as prohibited under 18 U.S.C. § 1591; § 1594(a). 286.
20 Defendant Gacad Officer forced Plaintiff S.L. to engage in commercial sex acts within the meaning
21 18 U.S.C. § 1591. These sex acts included kissing and groping her body, including her buttocks and
22 genitals.”

23 207. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Gacad knowingly recruited,
24 enticed, and solicited Plaintiff S.L. by making repeated romantic overtures, flirting, and harassing
25 her, and offering special benefits and things of value for sex acts.”

26 208. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Gacad made Plaintiff S.L.
27 commit these sexual acts through force, fraud, or coercion within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 1591.
28 He did so by: • Using physical force to grab Plaintiff S.L. and grope her body; • Assaulting her in

places where she could not easily escape; • Using his power and status as a correctional officer and work supervisor who has the power to control and direct incarcerated persons and their movements to have Plaintiff S.L. engage in commercial sexual acts with him; • Stalking her family's home and workplace to intimidate Plaintiff S.L.”

209. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, “These methods of force, fraud, and coercion were a plan designed to make Plaintiff S.L. believe that she would suffer serious harm should she not obey his sexual advances.”

210. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, “These tactics are part of a well-known scheme, plan, or pattern at FCI Dublin by a network of officers that were intended to cause a person to believe that failure to perform an act would result in serious harm or physical restraint.”

211. Defendant Officer Gacad exchanged valuable goods and special benefits for these sex acts. In this way, Defendant Officer Gacad's conduct constitutes an attempt to engage in sex in exchange for things of value, the definition of commerciality under 18 U.S.C. § 1591.

212. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, “These acts constitute civil wrongs inflicted on Plaintiff and actionable under 18 U.S.C. § 1595. 2.”

213. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, “Defendant's conduct has caused Plaintiff serious harm including, without limitation, physical, psychological, emotional, financial, and reputational harm and she has a claim for damages for such violations under 18 U.S.C. § 1591, 18 U.S.C. § 1595.”

214. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, “Defendant's conduct warrants the Court's imposition of compensatory and punitive damages against the Defendants.”

215. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, “Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1595, Plaintiff is entitled to recover damages and reasonable attorneys' fees for the Defendants' wrongful conduct.”

216. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officers Putnam, Vazquez, Serrano, and Lt. Jones together and individually obstructed or attempted to obstruct enforcement efforts or investigations into the sex trafficking of Plaintiff S.L. under 18 U.S.C. § 1591(d), 18 U.S.C. § 1592. They did so in the following ways: Defendant Officer Putnam stole Plaintiff S.L.'s personal property that contained evidence of her relationship with Defendant Officer Gacad; After being informed of the abuse, Defendant Officer Putnam failed to further investigate the sex trafficking committed by

Defendant Officer Gacad; Defendant Officers Serrano and Vazquez attempted to silence and isolate Plaintiff S.L.; Defendant Officers Serrano and Vazquez allowed other people to listen to her private conversations to track and interfere with her communications and ability to confidentially report; Defendant Officer Serrano read Plaintiff S.L.'s private mail out loud, and consistently humiliated her to intimidate her from report; Defendant Lt. Jones consistently threatened Plaintiff S.L. and humiliated her after S.L. reported in order to intimidate her from making future reports; Defendant Officers Vazquez, Serrano, and Lt. Jones also knowingly failed to report the abuse and harassment that Defendant Officer Gacad was committing."

217. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "These tactics are part of a well-known scheme, plan, or pattern at FCI Dublin by a network of officers that were intended to cause a person to believe that reporting would result in serious harm or physical restraint."

218. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "These acts constitute civil wrongs inflicted on Plaintiff and are actionable under 18 U.S.C. § 1595."

219. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendants' conduct has caused Plaintiff serious harm including, without limitation, physical, psychological, emotional, financial, and reputational harm, and she has a claim for damages for such violations under 18 U.S.C. § 1591, 18 U.S.C. § 1592, 18 U.S.C. § 1595."

220. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendants' conduct warrants the Court's imposition of compensatory and punitive damages against the Defendants."

221. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1595, Plaintiff is entitled to recover damages and reasonable attorneys' fees for the Defendants' wrongful conduct."

222. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Officer Vazquez engaged or attempted to engage in sex trafficking of Plaintiff A.H.R. as prohibited under 18 U.S.C. § 1591; § 1594(a)."

223. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Officer Vazquez forced Plaintiff A.H.R. to engage in commercial sex acts within the meaning 18 U.S.C. § 1591. These sex acts included kissing, hugging, and other physical touching."

224. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Officer Vazquez knowingly recruited, enticed, and solicited Plaintiff A.H.R. by removing him from his housing unit and work assignments

1 and exchanging special benefits and things of value for sex acts.”

2 225. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Vasquez made Plaintiff A.H.R.
3 commit these sex acts through force, fraud, or coercion within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 1591. He
4 did so by: Using his power and status as a correctional officer who has the power to control and
5 direct incarcerated persons and their movements in order to facilitate sex acts; Removing him from
6 his housing unit and work assignments into isolated locations to engage in sex acts; Interfering in his
7 romantic relationship with his partner to manipulate him.”

8 226. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “These methods of force, fraud, and coercion were a
9 plan designed to make Plaintiff A.H.R. believe that he would suffer serious harm should he not obey
10 the sexual advances.”

11 227. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “These tactics are part of a well-known scheme,
12 plan, or pattern at FCI Dublin by a network of officers that were intended to cause a person to believe
13 that failure to perform an act would result in serious harm or physical restraint.”

14 228. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Vazquez exchanged valuable
15 goods and special benefits for these sex acts. In this way, Defendant Officer Vazquez’s conduct
16 constitutes the attempt to engage in sex in exchange for things of value, the definition of
17 commerciality under 18 U.S.C. § 1591.”

18 229. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “These acts constitute civil wrongs inflicted on
19 Plaintiff and are actionable under 18 U.S.C. § 1595.”

20 230. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant’s conduct has caused Plaintiff serious
21 harm including, without limitation, physical, psychological, emotional, financial, and reputational
22 harm, and she has a claim for damages for such violations under 18 U.S.C. § 1591, 18 U.S.C. §
23 1595.’

24 231. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant’s conduct warrants the Court’s
25 imposition of compensatory and punitive damages against the Defendant. 312. Pursuant to 18 U.S.C.
26 § 1595, Plaintiff is entitled to recover damages and reasonable attorneys’ fees for the Defendant’s
27 wrongful conduct.”

28 232. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officers Jones and Bellhouse obtained

1 or attempted to obtain the forced labor of Plaintiff A.H.R. as prohibited under 18 U.S.C. § 1589.”

2 233. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officers Jones and Bellhouse forced
3 Plaintiff A.H.R. to work as a lookout to facilitate their sexual abuse and harassment of other
4 incarcerated persons in the facility which constitutes as labor under 18 U.S.C. § 1589. 315. Defendant
5 Officers Jones and Bellhouse provided valuable goods in exchange for A.H.R.’s work as a lookout.”

6 234. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Jones and Bellhouse, who had
7 the power to control and direct incarcerated persons, coerced Plaintiff A.H.R. to perform these
8 services by using their power and status as correctional officers and work supervisors of Plaintiff
9 A.H.R.”

10 235. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officers Jones and Bellhouse forced
11 Plaintiff A.H.R. into performing this service by a scheme, plan, or pattern of retaliatory actions that
12 intended to cause Plaintiff A.H.R. to believe that if he did not perform such services, he would suffer
13 serious harm or physical restraint.”

14 236. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “These acts constitute civil wrongs inflicted on
15 Plaintiff and are actionable under 18 U.S.C. § 1595.”

16 237. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendants’ conduct has caused Plaintiff serious
17 harm including, without limitation, physical, psychological, emotional, financial, and reputational
18 harm, and he has a claim for damages for such violations under 18 U.S.C. § 1589, 18 U.S.C. § 1595.”

19 238. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendants’ conduct warrants the Court’s
20 imposition of punitive damages against the Defendants.”

21 239. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1595, Plaintiff is entitled
22 to recover damages and reasonable attorneys’ fees for the Defendants’ wrongful conduct.”

23 240. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Serrano obstructed or attempted
24 to obstruct enforcement efforts or investigations into the sex trafficking of Plaintiff A.H.R. under 18
25 U.S.C. § 1591(d); 18 U.S.C. § 1592. He did so by: Assisting Defendant Officer Vazquez in obtaining
26 and taking Plaintiff A.H.R. to locations where he could sexually abuse him; Making direct threats to
27 Plaintiff A.H.R. to prevent him and others from reporting abuse; Interfering with Plaintiff A.H.R.’s
28 relationship to manipulate him; Failing to report Defendant Officer Vazquez’s abuse.”

1 241. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "These tactics are part of a well-known scheme,
2 plan, or pattern at FCI Dublin by a network of officers that was intended to cause a person to believe
3 that reporting would result in serious harm or physical restraint."

4 242. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "These acts constitute civil wrongs inflicted on
5 Plaintiff and are actionable under 18 U.S.C. § 1595."

6 243. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant's conduct has caused Plaintiff serious
7 harm including, without limitation, physical, psychological, emotional, financial, and reputational
8 harm, and he has a claim for damages for such violations under 18 U.S.C. § 1591, 18 U.S.C. §1592,
9 18 U.S.C. § 1595."

10 244. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant's conduct warrants the Court's
11 imposition of compensatory and punitive damages against the Defendant."

12 245. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1595, Plaintiff is entitled
13 to recover damages and reasonable attorneys' fees for the Defendant's wrongful conduct."

14 246. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Officer Nunley engaged or attempted to
15 engage in sex trafficking of Plaintiff G.M. as prohibited under 18 U.S.C. § 1591; § 1594(a)."

16 247. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Officer Nunley forced Plaintiff G.M. to
17 engage in commercial sex acts within the meaning 18 U.S.C. § 1591. These sex acts included
18 rubbing his penis on Plaintiff, kissing her, and other sexual touching."

19 248. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Officer Nunley knowingly recruited,
20 enticed, and solicited Plaintiff G.M. by frequently requesting sex acts, leaving instructions for where
21 Plaintiff could commit sex acts, and exchanging special benefits and things of value for sex acts."

22 249. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Officer Nunley made Plaintiff G.M.
23 commit these sex acts through force, fraud, or coercion within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 1591. He
24 did so by: Using physical force to sexually touch her; Using his power and status as a correctional
25 officer and as Plaintiff G.M.'s work supervisor who had the power to control and direct incarcerated
26 persons and their movements and control access to disciplinary records, in order facilitate sexual acts;
27 Offering to provide benefits and things of value for sex."

28 250. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "These methods of force, fraud, and coercion were a

1 plan designed to make Plaintiff G.M. believe that she would suffer serious harm should she not obey
2 his sexual advances.”

3 251. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “These tactics are part of a well-known scheme,
4 plan, or pattern at FCI Dublin by a network of officers that were intended to cause a person to believe
5 that failure to perform an act would result in serious harm or physical restraint against any person.”

6 252. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Nunley exchanged offers of
7 money and special benefits for these sex acts. In this way, Defendant Officer Nunley’s conduct
8 constitutes the attempt to engage in sex in exchange for things of value, the definition of
9 commerciality under 18 U.S.C. § 1591.”

10 253. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “These acts constitute civil wrongs inflicted on
11 Plaintiff and actionable under 18 U.S.C. § 1595.”

12 254. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant’s conduct has caused Plaintiff serious
13 harm including, without limitation, physical, psychological, emotional, financial, and reputational
14 harm, and she has a claim for damages for such violations under 18 U.S.C. § 1591, 18 U.S.C. §
15 1595.”

16 255. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant’s conduct warrants the Court’s
17 imposition of compensatory and punitive damages against the Defendant.”

18 256. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1595, Plaintiff is entitled
19 to recover damages and reasonable attorneys’ fees for the Defendant’s wrongful conduct.”

20 257. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Smith engaged or attempted to
21 engage in sex trafficking of Plaintiff G.M. as prohibited under 18 U.S.C. § 1591; § 1594(a).”

22 258. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Smith forced Plaintiff G.M. to
23 engage in commercial sex acts within the meaning 18 U.S.C. § 1591. These sex acts included forcing
24 her to show him her naked body.”

25 259. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Smith knowingly recruited,
26 enticed, and solicited Plaintiff G.M. by requesting sexual favors.”

27 260. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Smith made Plaintiff G.M.
28 commit these sex acts through force, fraud, or coercion within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 1591. He

1 did so by: Physically coercing or restraining Plaintiff G.M. by cornering her in areas where she could
2 not easily escape; Using his power and status as a correctional officer who had the power to control
3 and direct incarcerated persons and their movements, in order facilitate sexual acts; Withholding
4 basic necessities for sexual favors.”

5 261. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “These methods of force, fraud, and coercion were a
6 plan designed to make Plaintiff G.M. believe that she would suffer serious harm if she did not obey
7 his sexual advances.”

8 262. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “These tactics are part of a well-known scheme,
9 plan, or pattern at FCI Dublin by a network of officers that was intended to cause a person to believe
10 that failure to perform an act would result in serious harm to or physical restraint against any person.”

11 263. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Smith exchanged special
12 benefits and things of value in exchange for sexual acts.”

13 264. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “In this way, Defendant Officer Smith’s conduct
14 constitutes the attempt to engage in sex in exchange for things of value, the definition of
15 commerciality under 18 U.S.C. § 1591.”

16 265. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “These acts constitute civil wrongs inflicted on
17 Plaintiff and actionable under 18 U.S.C. § 1595.”

18 266. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant’s conduct has caused Plaintiff serious
19 harm including, without limitation, physical, psychological, emotional, financial, and reputational
20 harm, and she has a claim for damages for such violations under 18 U.S.C. § 1591, 18 U.S.C. §
21 1595.”

22 267. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant’s conduct warrants the Court’s
23 imposition of compensatory and punitive damages against the Defendant. 350. Pursuant to 18 U.S.C.
24 § 1595, Plaintiff is entitled to recover damages and reasonable attorneys’ fees for the Defendant’s
25 wrongful conduct.”

26 268. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officers Putnam and Shirley and
27 Defendant Lt. Jones together and individually obstructed or attempted to obstruct enforcement efforts
28 or investigations into the sex trafficking of Plaintiff G.M. under 18 U.S.C. § 1591(d), 18 U.S.C.

§1592. They did so in the following ways: Defendant Lt. Putnam failed to further investigate the abuse by Defendants Nunley and Smith after G.M. reported it to him; Defendant Officer Shirley threatened and intimidated G.M. by questioning her about her reporting; Defendant Lt. Jones individually threatened Plaintiff and threatened to engage in collective punishment.”

269. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “These tactics are part of a well-known scheme, plan, or pattern at FCI Dublin by a network of officers that was intended to cause a person to believe that reporting would result in serious harm or physical restraint against any person.”

270. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “These acts constitute civil wrongs inflicted on Plaintiff and actionable under 18 U.S.C. § 1595.”

271. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendants’ conduct has caused Plaintiff serious harm including, without limitation, physical, psychological, emotional, financial, and reputational harm, and she has a claim for damages for such violations under 18 U.S.C. § 1591, 18 U.S.C. §1592, 18 U.S.C. § 1595.”

272. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendants’ conduct warrants the Court’s imposition of compensatory and punitive damages against the Defendants.”

273. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1595, Plaintiff is entitled to recover damages and reasonable attorneys’ fees for the Defendants’ wrongful conduct.”

274. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Smith engaged or attempted to engage in sex trafficking of Plaintiff A.S. as prohibited under 18 U.S.C. § 1591; § 1594(a).”

275. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Smith forced Plaintiff A.S. to engage in commercial sex acts within the meaning 18 U.S.C. § 1591. These sex acts included forcing her to strip, stand naked, and watch him as he masturbated.”

276. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Smith knowingly recruited, enticed, and solicited Plaintiff A.S. by requesting sexual favors and using his power as a correctional officer to lead her into locations where he directed her to how him her body.”

277. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Smith made Plaintiff A.S. commit these sex acts through force, fraud, or coercion within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 1591. He did so by: Harassing and abusing Plaintiff A.S. in areas where she could not easily escape; Using his

1 power and status as a correctional officer who had the power to control and direct incarcerated
2 persons and their movements, control access to disciplinary records, and conduct searches, in order
3 facilitate sexual acts; Threatening abuse of process in the form of disciplinary actions; Restricting
4 access to basic necessities.”

5 278. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “These methods of force, fraud, and coercion were a
6 plan designed to make Plaintiff A.S. believe that she would suffer serious harm should she not obey
7 his sexual advances.”

8 279. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “These tactics are part of a well-known scheme,
9 plan, or pattern at FCI Dublin by a network of officers that were intended to cause a person to believe
10 that failure to perform an act would result in serious harm or physical restraint against any person.”

11 280. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Smith exchanged basic
12 necessities and things of value for sexual acts. In this way, Defendant Officer Smith’s conduct
13 constitutes the attempt to engage in sex in exchange for things of value, the definition of
14 commerciality under 18 U.S.C. § 1591.”

15 281. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “These acts constitute civil wrongs inflicted on
16 Plaintiff and actionable under 18 U.S.C. § 1595.”

17 282. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant’s conduct has caused Plaintiff serious
18 harm including, without limitation, physical, psychological, emotional, financial, and reputational
19 harm, and she has a claim for damages for such violations under 18 U.S.C. § 1591, 18 U.S.C. §
20 1595.”

21 283. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant’s conduct warrants the Court’s
22 imposition of compensatory and punitive damages against the Defendant.”

23 284. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1595, Plaintiff is entitled
24 to recover damages and reasonable attorneys’ fees for the Defendant’s wrongful conduct.”

25 285. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Smith obtained or attempted to
26 obtain the forced labor of Plaintiff A.S. as prohibited under 18 U.S.C. § 1589.”

27 286. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Smith knowingly forced
28 Plaintiff A.S. to perform sex acts including stripping and other sexual acts. As such this constitutes

1 sex work as labor that was part of under 18 U.S.C. § 1589(a). In exchange for this forced work,
2 Defendant Officer Smith paid Plaintiff A.S. with basic necessities and special benefits.”

3 287. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Smith made Plaintiff A.S.
4 commit labor by force, restraint, or abuse of law or process within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 1589.
5 He did so by: Forcing Plaintiff to perform these acts in areas where she could not easily escape;
6 Using his power and status as a correctional officer who had the power to control and direct
7 incarcerated persons and their movements, control access to disciplinary records, and conduct
8 searches, in order facilitate sexual acts; Threatening abuse of process in the form of disciplinary
9 actions if she did not perform this labor; Restricting access to basic necessities if she did not perform
10 this labor.”

11 288. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Smith forced Plaintiff A.S. into
12 performing this service by a scheme, plan, or pattern of retaliatory actions that was intended to cause
13 Plaintiff A.S. to believe that if she did not perform such services, she would suffer serious harm or
14 physical restraint.”

15 289. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “These tactics are part of a well-known scheme,
16 plan, or pattern at FCI Dublin by a network of officers that was intended to cause a person to believe
17 that failure to perform labor would result in serious harm or physical restraint against any person.”

18 290. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “These acts constitute civil wrongs inflicted on
19 Plaintiff and are actionable under 18 U.S.C. § 1595.”

20 291. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant’s conduct has caused Plaintiff serious
21 harm including, without limitation, physical, psychological, emotional, financial, and reputational
22 harm, and she has a claim for damages for such violations under 18 U.S.C. § 1589, 18 U.S.C. §
23 1595.”

24 292. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant’s conduct warrants the Court’s
25 imposition of punitive damages against the Defendant.”

26 293. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1595, Plaintiff is entitled
27 to recover damages and reasonable attorneys’ fees for the Defendant’s wrongful conduct.”
28

294. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendants Officer Lewis and Lt. Jones obstructed or attempted to obstruct enforcement efforts or investigations into the sex trafficking and labor trafficking of Plaintiff A.S. under 18 U.S.C. § 1591(d), 18 U.S.C. §1592. She did so in the following ways: • Defendant Lt. Jones directly threatened Plaintiff A.S. through abuse of process by directly stating she was retaliating against A.S. and others who reported abuse. • Defendant Officer Lewis forced A.S. to unzip her sweatshirt everyday as a form of intimidation while threatening her to "keep running her mouth." "

295. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "These tactics are part of a well-known scheme, plan, or pattern at FCI Dublin by a network of officers that was intended to cause a person to believe that reporting would result in serious harm or physical restraint against any person."

296. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "These acts constitute civil wrongs inflicted on Plaintiff and actionable under 18 U.S.C. § 1595."

297. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendants' conduct has caused Plaintiff serious harm including, without limitation, physical, psychological, emotional, financial, and reputational harm, and she has a claim for damages for such violations under 18 U.S.C. § 1589, 18 U.S.C. § 1591, 18 U.S.C. §1592, 18 U.S.C. § 1595."

298. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendants' conduct warrants the Court's imposition of compensatory and punitive damages against the Defendants."

299. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1595, Plaintiff is entitled to recover damages and reasonable attorneys' fees for the Defendants' wrongful conduct."

300. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Officer Jones engaged or attempted to engage in sex trafficking of Plaintiff J.L. as prohibited under 18 U.S.C. § 1591; § 1594(a)."

301. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Officer Jones forced Plaintiff J.L. to engage in commercial sex acts within the meaning 18 U.S.C. § 1591. These sex acts included forcing her to engage in vaginal and oral sex, groping her body, and sucking on her breast."

302. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Officer Jones knowingly recruited, enticed, and solicited Plaintiff J.L. by flirting with her, and using his authority as a correctional officer to direct her into locations where he could be alone with her and force her to commit sex

1 acts.”

2 303. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Jones made Plaintiff J.L.
3 commit these sex acts through force, fraud, or coercion within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 1591. He
4 did so by: • Locking Plaintiff J.L. into areas without an ability to escape if she did not perform sexual
5 acts; • Using his power and status as a correctional officer and as her work supervisor, who had the
6 power to control and direct prisoners and their movement or acts, in order facilitate sexual acts; •
7 Using physical force to make Plaintiff J.L. commit these acts; • Using threats of harm to make
8 Plaintiff J.L. believe she would be seriously harmed if she did not perform these sex acts or if she
9 reported; • Using threats of abuse of process by making Plaintiff J.L. believe she would have negative
10 consequences for reporting.”

11 304. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “These methods of force, fraud, and coercion were a
12 plan designed to make Plaintiff J.L. believe that she would suffer serious harm should she not obey
13 his sexual advances.”

14 305. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “These tactics are part of a well-known scheme,
15 plan, or pattern at FCI Dublin by a network of officers that were intended to cause a person to believe
16 that failure to perform an act would result in serious harm or physical restraint against any person.”

17 306. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Jones exchanged special
18 benefits and things of value for sexual acts.”

19 307. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “In this way, Defendant Officer Jones’ conduct
20 constitutes an attempt to engage in sex in exchange for things of value, the definition of
21 commerciality under 18 U.S.C. § 1591.”

22 308. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “These acts constitute civil wrongs inflicted on
23 Plaintiff J.L. and actionable under 18 U.S.C. § 1595.”

24 309. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant’s conduct has caused Plaintiff serious
25 harm including, without limitation, physical, psychological, emotional, financial, and reputational
26 harm, and she has a claim for damages for such violations under 18 U.S.C. § 1591, 18 U.S.C. §
27 1595.”

28 310. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant’s conduct warrants the Court’s

1 imposition of compensatory and punitive damages against the Defendant.”

2 311. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1595, Plaintiff is entitled
3 to recover damages and reasonable attorneys’ fees for the Defendant’s wrongful conduct.”

4 312. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Jones knowingly obtained or
5 attempted to obtain forced labor from Plaintiff J.L. as prohibited under 18 U.S.C. § 1589.”

6 313. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Jones forced Plaintiff J.L. to
7 perform sex acts as sex work which constitutes as labor under 18 U.S.C. § 1589.”

8 314. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Jones knowingly forced
9 Plaintiff J.L. to perform sex acts including groping, sexual touching, and vaginal sex on a number of
10 occasions. This often happened while J.L. was working in her job while Defendant Officer Jones
11 supervised her. During her shift hours, he would order her into spaces where she was cornered in
12 order to force her to perform sex acts. As such, this conduct constitutes sex work as labor that was
13 part of her job under 18 U.S.C. § 1589 (a).”

14 315. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Jones made Plaintiff J.L.
15 commit labor by force, restraint, or abuse of law or process within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 1589.
16 He did so by: Locking Plaintiff in areas without an ability to escape if she did not perform sexual
17 acts; Using his power and status as a correctional officer and as her work supervisor, who had the
18 power to control and direct incarcerated persons and their movement or acts, in order facilitate sexual
19 acts; Using physical force to make Plaintiff J.L. commit these acts; Using threats to make Plaintiff
20 J.L. believe she would be seriously harmed if she did not perform this labor; Threats of abuse of
21 process by making Plaintiff J.L. believe she would have negative consequences for reporting.”

22 316. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Jones forced Plaintiff J.L. into
23 performing this service by a scheme, plan, or pattern of retaliatory actions that intended to cause
24 Plaintiff J.L. to believe that if she did not perform such services, she would suffer serious harm or
25 physical restraint.”

26 317. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “These tactics are part of a well-known scheme,
27 plan, or pattern at FCI Dublin by a network of officers that was intended to cause a person to believe
28 that failure to perform labor would result in serious harm or physical restraint against any person.”

1 318. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "These acts constitute civil wrongs inflicted on
2 Plaintiff and are actionable under 18 U.S.C. § 1595."

3 319. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant's conduct has caused Plaintiff serious
4 harm including, without limitation, physical, psychological, emotional, financial, and reputational
5 harm, and she has a claim for damages for such violations under 18 U.S.C. § 1589, 18 U.S.C. §
6 1595."

7 320. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant's conduct warrants the Court's
8 imposition of compensatory and punitive damages against the Defendants."

9 321. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1595, Plaintiff is entitled
10 to recover damages and reasonable attorneys' fees for the Defendant's wrongful conduct."

11 322. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendants Officer Jones, Officer Pool, and Lt.
12 Putnam together and individually obstructed or attempted to obstruct enforcement efforts or
13 investigations into the labor trafficking of Plaintiff J.L. under 18 U.S.C. § 1591(d), 18 U.S.C. §1592.
14 They did so in the following ways: • Defendant Officer Jones directly threatened Plaintiff J.L. with
15 serious risk of harm if she reported his abuse; • Defendant Officer Pool taunted and failed to report
16 Defendant Andrew Jones's exploitation when he was present in the exploitation; • Defendant Lt.
17 Putnam failed to further investigate Defendant Andrew Jones's abuse and exploitation of Plaintiff
18 J.L. after she reported it."

19 323. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "These tactics are part of a well-known scheme,
20 plan, or pattern at FCI Dublin by a network of officers that were intended to cause a person to believe
21 that reporting would result in serious harm or physical restraint against any person."

22 324. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "These acts constitute civil wrongs inflicted on
23 Plaintiff and are actionable under 18 U.S.C. § 1595."

24 325. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendants' conduct has caused Plaintiff serious
25 harm including, without limitation, physical, psychological, emotional, financial, and reputational
26 harm, and she has a claim for damages for such violations under 18 U.S.C. § 1589, 18 U.S.C. §1592,
27 18 U.S.C. § 1595."

28 326. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendants' conduct warrants the Court's

1 imposition of compensatory and punitive damages against the Defendants.”

2 327. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1595, Plaintiff is entitled
3 to recover damages and reasonable attorneys’ fees for the Defendants’ wrongful conduct.”

4 328. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Smith engaged or attempted to
5 engage in sex trafficking of Plaintiff L.T. as prohibited under 18 U.S.C. § 1591; § 1594(a).”

6 329. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Smith forced Plaintiff L.T. to
7 engage in commercial sex acts within the meaning 18 U.S.C. § 1591. These sex acts included strip
8 shows and sexual touching.”

9 330. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Smith knowingly recruited,
10 enticed, and solicited Plaintiff L.T. by propositioning her to allow him to touch her, and requesting
11 her to dance for him.”

12 331. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Smith made Plaintiff L.T.
13 commit these sex acts through force, fraud, or coercion within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 1591. He
14 did so by: • Using his power and status as a correctional officer who had the power to control and
15 direct prisoners and their movement or acts in order facilitate sexual acts; • Cornering her in her cell
16 where she had no way to escape to coerce her to strip; • Using special benefits to coerce her into
17 performing these sex acts.”

18 332. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “These methods of force, fraud, and coercion were a
19 plan designed to make Plaintiff L.T. believe that she would suffer serious harm should she not obey
20 his sexual advances.”

21 333. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “These tactics are part of a well-known scheme,
22 plan, or pattern at FCI Dublin by a network of officers that were intended to cause a person to believe
23 that failure to perform an act would result in serious harm or physical restraint against any person.”

24 334. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendant Officer Smith exchanged special
25 benefits and things of value for sexual acts.”

26 335. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “In this way, Defendant Officer Smith’s conduct
27 constitutes an attempt to engage in sex in exchange for things of value, the definition of
28 commerciality under 18 U.S.C. § 1591.”

1 336. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "These acts constitute civil wrongs inflicted on
2 Plaintiff L.T. and actionable under 18 U.S.C. § 1595."

3 337. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant's conduct has caused Plaintiff serious
4 harm including, without limitation, physical, psychological, emotional, financial, and reputational
5 harm, and she has a claim for damages for such violations under 18 U.S.C. § 1591, 18 U.S.C. §
6 1595."

7 338. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant's conduct warrants the Court's
8 imposition of compensatory and punitive damages against the Defendant."

9 339. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1595, Plaintiff is entitled
10 to recover damages and reasonable attorneys' fees for the Defendant's wrongful conduct. Plaintiff
11 L.T. Against Defendant Officer Smith (Forced Labor)."

12 340. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Officer Smith knowingly obtained or
13 attempted to obtain forced labor from Plaintiff L.T as prohibited under 18 U.S.C. § 1589."

14 341. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Officer Smith forced Plaintiff L.T. to
15 perform stripping as sex work which constitutes as labor under 18 U.S.C. § 1589."

16 342. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Officer Smith made Plaintiff L.T.
17 commit labor by force, restraint, or abuse of law or process within the meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 1589.
18 He did so by: • Using his power and status as a correctional officer who had the power to control and
19 direct prisoners and their movement or acts in order facilitate sexual acts; • Cornering her in her cell
20 where she had no way to escape to coerce her to strip."

21 343. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant Officer Smith forced Plaintiff L.T. into
22 performing this service by a scheme, plan, or pattern of retaliatory actions that intended to cause
23 Plaintiff L.T. to believe that if she did not perform such services, she would suffer serious harm or
24 physical restraint. 428. These tactics are part of a well-known scheme, plan, or pattern at FCI Dublin
25 by a network of officers that was intended to cause a person to believe that failure to perform labor
26 would result in serious harm or physical restraint against any person."

27 344. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "These acts constitute civil wrongs inflicted on
28 Plaintiff and are actionable under 18 U.S.C. § 1595."

1 345. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant's conduct has caused Plaintiff serious
2 harm including, without limitation, physical, psychological, emotional, financial, and reputational
3 harm, and she has a claim for damages for such violations under 18 U.S.C. § 1589, 18 U.S.C. §
4 1595."

5 346. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Defendant's conduct warrants the Court's
6 imposition of compensatory and punitive damages against the Defendants."

7 347. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1595, Plaintiff is entitled
8 to recover damages and reasonable attorneys' fees for the Defendant's wrongful conduct."

9 348. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "The Trafficking Victims Protection Act establishes
10 that "[w]hoever conspires with another to violate section 1581, 1583, 1589, 1590, or 1592 shall be
11 punished in the same manner as a completed violation of such section; . . . [and w]hoever conspires
12 with another to violate section 1591 shall be fined under this title, imprisoned for any term of years or
13 for life, or both." 18 U.S.C. § 1594 (b), (c)."

14 349. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "The TVPA allows "[an] individual who is a victim
15 of a violation of this chapter [to] bring a civil action against the perpetrator (or whoever knowingly
16 benefits, or attempts or conspires to benefit, financially or by receiving anything of value from
17 participation in a venture which that person knew or should have known has engaged in an act in
18 violation of this chapter) in an appropriate district court of the United States and may recover
19 damages and reasonable attorney's fees." 18 U.S.C. § 1595(a)."

20 350. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "Congress grants a plaintiff up to ten years in which
21 to bring a civil action under 18 U.S.C. § 1595(c)."

22 351. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "At all relevant times, Defendants knowingly
23 agreed, contrived, confederated, acted in concert, aided and abetted, and/or conspired to continue
24 their longstanding practice of exchanging sex for valuable goods or special benefits as defined in 18
25 U.S.C. § 1591, or obtaining forced labor as defined in 18 U.S.C. § 1589 by coercing incarcerated
26 people to perform sexual acts or to act as lookouts as the Defendants engaged in sexual acts."

27 352. Plaintiffs' Complaint alleges that, "All Defendants conspired to recruit, entice, harbor,
28 transport, provide, obtain, maintain, patronize, solicit, or benefit from participation in the sex and/or

labor trafficking of Plaintiffs as defined by 18 U.S.C. § 1581 et. seq.”

353. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendants committed overt acts in furtherance of the agreement or understanding by committing one or more of the following acts: • Directly receiving or attempting to receive sexual acts or labor in exchange for valuable goods or benefits; Directly working as lookouts themselves while perpetrating officers engaged or attempted to engage in sexual acts; Forcing or coercing other incarcerated people to act as lookouts while perpetuating officers engaged or attempted to engage in sexual acts in exchange for valuable goods or benefits; Transporting or directing incarcerated people into locations where principal perpetrating officers could engage or attempt in engage in sexual acts; Engaging in a range of retaliatory tactics to threaten and silence survivors or witnesses of sexual abuse or trafficking including but not limited to threats of physical abuse and/or restraint, threats of law or process, indiscriminate searches, taunting, and humiliation; Knowingly refusing to report abuse or trafficking occurring at FCI Dublin =and/or obstructing investigation into abuse or trafficking; Ensuring confidential means of reporting abuse is not possible by indiscriminately opening legal mail, monitoring confidential or private communications, interfering with confidential or private communications, and intentionally preventing access to reporting mechanisms such as grievances and other reporting lines; Maintaining practices, policies, and procedures that allowed Defendants to benefit from unlawful commercial sex ventures and human trafficking.”

354. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendants’ participation and assistance in the furtherance of an illegal sex trafficking plan and/or purpose was intentional and/or willful and, therefore, Defendants intentionally and/or willfully caused the facilitation of the sex acts in support of their trafficking venture.”

355. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendants knew or should have known that their acts supported and facilitated a trafficking venture.”

356. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendants’ conspiracy kept Plaintiffs and other witnesses of the trafficking from taking meaningful action, resulting in significant injuries to Plaintiffs and additional victims.”

357. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “Defendants’ conduct caused Plaintiffs serious harm

1 including, without limitation, physical, psychological, emotional, financial, and reputational harm,
 2 and Plaintiffs have claims for damages for such violations under 18 U.S.C. § 1584; 18 U.S.C. § 1589,
 3 18 U.S.C. § 1591; 18 U.S.C. § 1595.”

4 358. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “An order certifying that this action may be
 5 maintained as a class action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23.”

6 359. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “A declaratory judgment that the conditions, acts,
 7 omissions, policies, and practices described above are in violation of the rights of Plaintiffs and the
 8 class they represent under the United States Constitution.”

9 360. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “An order requiring Defendants, their agents,
 10 officials, employees, and all persons acting in concert with them or otherwise to (1) adequately, hire,
 11 train and supervise its employees to prevent their ongoing sexual misconduct and abuse of power; (2)
 12 implement a confidential and reliably available method for individuals to report abuse to fully
 13 independent outside authorities who are not employed by the BOP; (3) properly investigate claims of
 14 abuse; (4) immediately cease the practice of placing individuals who report sexual abuse into solitary
 15 confinement in the SHU; (5) address rampant retaliation against survivors, including but not limited
 16 to placement in solitary confinement, punitive cell and strip searches, and punitive transfers, which
 17 harm survivors and deter others from reporting; (6) ensure that officers who have substantiated
 18 claims of sexual abuse and harassment against them are promptly fired and not permitted to return to
 19 BOP employment; (7) provide constitutionally adequate medical and mental health care to survivors
 20 of sexual abuse; (8) provide timely and consistent access to confidential attorney calls and visits; (9)
 21 provide survivors with documentation of reports of staff misconduct and promptly facilitate the U-
 22 visa certification process for noncitizen survivors who report and assist in the investigation of sexual
 23 abuse; (10) create a process to assist survivors of abuse with compassionate release petitions; (11)
 24 install fixed cameras in areas where abuse is known to occur and properly monitor and maintain the
 25 fixed cameras that do exist; and (12) address increasingly dire living conditions that contribute to the
 26 ongoing sexual exploitation of incarcerated persons.”

27 361. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “An order enjoining Defendants, their agents,
 28 officials, employees, and all persons acting in concert from continuing the unlawful acts, conditions,

1 and practices described in this Complaint.”

2 362. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “An award of compensatory, punitive, and nominal
3 damages to each named Plaintiff in an amount to be determined at trial.”

4 363. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “An award to Plaintiffs, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§
5 1988 and 12205 of the costs of this suit and reasonable attorneys’ fees and litigation expenses”

6 364. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “An order retaining jurisdiction of this case until
7 Defendants have fully complied with the orders of this Court, and there is a reasonable assurance that
8 Defendants will continue to comply in the future absent continuing jurisdiction.”

9 365. Plaintiffs’ Complaint alleges that, “For such other and further relief as this Court may
10 deem just and proper.”

11 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

12 **CONTRIBUTION**

13 **(Against All Cross-Defendants)**

14 366. CC-OG hereby realleges and incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in
15 paragraphs 1 through 365, inclusive, above, as though set forth in full herein.

16 367. CC-OG is entitled as a matter of law to seek contribution from Cross-Defendants
17 arising from and/or related to any and all liability and/or damages sought by Plaintiffs in their civil
18 action that names CC-OG in the COMPLAINT as a party Defendant.

19 368. As a direct and proximate result of the acts, omissions, and/or misconduct alleged to
20 have been committed or engaged in by or among Cross-Defendants against Plaintiffs in the
21 COMPLAINT in their civil action, CC-OG is entitled as a matter of law to seek contribution from
22 Cross-Defendants.

23 369. As a direct and proximate result of Plaintiffs initiating a civil action against CC-OG
24 and naming CC-OG in the COMPLAINT as a party Defendant, CC-OG has and will continue to
25 incur, sustain, and/or otherwise suffer substantial monetary harm, loss, injury, and/or damages,
26 including having to pay attorneys’ fees, costs, and/or expenses in his defense in the civil action
27 initiated by Plaintiffs; being responsible for paying any and all monetary awards for damages to
28

Plaintiffs in their civil action; as well as in relation to paying attorneys' fees, costs, and/or expenses in relation to bringing forth the instant Cross-Complaint against Cross-Defendants herein.

WHEREFORE, CC-OG requests the Court grant judgment in favor of CC-OG and against Cross-Defendants and award relief by granting contribution to CC-OG from Cross-Defendants for: (1) paying CC-OG's attorneys' fees, costs, and/or expenses in defending against Plaintiffs' claims for damages contained in the COMPLAINT filed in their civil action; (2) paying CC-OG's ordered amount of monetary damages awarded to Plaintiffs in their civil action against Defendants, including against CC-OG; (3) paying CC-OG's attorneys' fees, costs, and/or expenses in relation to bringing forth the instant Cross-Complaint against Cross-Defendants herein; and (4) for such further relief as the Court deems proper and necessary

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

INDEMNIFICATION

(Against All Cross-Defendants)

370. CC-OG hereby reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 369, inclusive, above, as though set forth in full herein.

371. CC-OG is entitled as a matter of law to seek indemnification from Cross-Defendants arising from and/or related to any and all liability and/or damages sought by Plaintiffs in their civil action that names CC-OG in the COMPLAINT as a party Defendant.

372. CC-OG is entitled as a matter of law to seek indemnification from Cross-Defendants arising from and/or related to Cross-Defendants fault arising from and/or related to liability and damages incurred, suffered, and/or otherwise sustained by Plaintiffs in their civil action that names CC-OG in the COMPLAINT as a party Defendant.

373. CC-OG is entitled as a matter of law to seek indemnification from Cross-Defendants who are equitably responsible for any and all damages incurred, suffered, and/or otherwise sustained by CC-OG arising from and/or related to Plaintiffs civil action that names CC-OG in the COMPLAINT as a party Defendant.

374. As a direct and proximate result of the acts, omissions, and/or misconduct alleged to have been committed or engaged in by or among Cross-Defendants against Plaintiffs in the COMPLAINT in their civil action, CC-OG is entitled as a matter of law to seek indemnification from Cross-Defendants.

375. As a direct and proximate result of Plaintiffs initiating a civil action against CC-OG and naming CC-OG in the COMPLAINT as a party Defendant, CC-OG has and will continue to incur, sustain, and/or otherwise suffer substantial monetary harm, loss, injury, and/or damages, including having to pay attorneys' fees, costs, and/or expenses in his defense in the civil action initiated by Plaintiffs; being responsible for paying any and all monetary awards for damages to Plaintiffs in their civil action; as well as in relation to paying attorneys' fees, costs, and/or expenses in relation to bringing forth the instant Cross-Complaint against Cross-Defendants herein.

WHEREFORE, CC-OG requests the Court grant judgment in favor of CC-OG and against Cross-Defendants and award relief by granting indemnification to CC-OG from Cross-Defendants for: (1) paying CC-OG's attorneys' fees, costs, and/or expenses in defending against Plaintiffs' claims for damages contained in the COMPLAINT filed in their civil action; (2) paying CC-OG's ordered amount of monetary damages awarded to Plaintiffs in their civil action against Defendants, including against CC-OG; (3) paying CC-OG's attorneys' fees, costs, and/or expenses in relation to bringing forth the instant Cross-Complaint against Cross-Defendants herein; and (4) for such further relief as the Court deems proper and necessary.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

DECLARATORY RELIEF

(Against All Cross-Defendants)

376. CC-OGs hereby reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 119, inclusive, above, as though set forth in full herein.

377. There exists an actual controversy relating to the legal rights and duties of the respective parties under a written instrument and/or several written instrument(s) and CC-OG requests that these rights and duties be adjudged by the Court.

378. As a direct and proximate result of Plaintiffs initiating a civil action against CC-OG and naming CC-OG in the COMPLAINT as a party Defendant, CC-OG has and will continue to incur, sustain, and/or otherwise suffer substantial monetary harm, loss, injury, and/or damages, including having to pay attorneys' fees, costs, and/or expenses in his defense in the civil action initiated by Plaintiffs; being responsible for paying any and all monetary awards for damages to Plaintiffs in their civil action; as well as in relation to paying attorneys' fees, costs, and/or expenses in relation to bringing forth the instant Cross-Complaint against Cross-Defendants herein.

379. As a direct and proximate result of Plaintiffs initiating a civil action against CC-OG and naming CC-OG in the COMPLAINT as a party Defendant, CC-OG requests that the Court grant judgment in favor of CC-OG and against Cross-Defendants and declare that: (1) Cross-Defendants shall be solely responsible for paying CC-OG's attorneys' fees, costs, and/or expenses in defending against Plaintiffs' claims for damages contained in the COMPLAINT filed in the civil action; (2) Cross-Defendants shall be solely responsible for paying the entire ordered amount of monetary damages awarded to Plaintiffs in the civil action against Defendants, including CC-OG; (3) Cross-Defendants shall be solely responsible for paying CC-OG's attorneys' fees, costs, and/or expenses in relation to bringing forth the instant Cross-Complaint against Cross-Defendants herein; and (4) for such further relief as the Court deems proper and necessary.

WHEREFORE, CC-OG requests the Court grant judgment in favor of CC-OG and against Cross-Defendants and award relief by granting declaratory relief to CC-OG from Cross-Defendants and declaring that: (1) Cross-Defendants shall be solely responsible for paying CC-OG's attorneys' fees, costs, and/or expenses in defending against Plaintiffs' claims for damages contained in the COMPLAINT filed in the civil action; (2) Cross-Defendants shall be solely responsible for paying the entire ordered amount of monetary damages awarded to Plaintiffs in the civil action against Defendants, including CC-OG; (3) Cross-Defendants shall be solely responsible for paying CC-OG's attorneys' fees, costs, and/or expenses in relation to bringing forth the instant Cross-Complaint against Cross-Defendants herein; and (4) for such further relief as the Court deems proper and necessary.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, CC-OG pray for relief and judgment against Cross-Defendants as follows:

1. As to the First Cause of Action for judgment in favor of CC-OG and against Cross-Defendants and award CC-OGs relief by granting contribution to CC-OG from Cross-Defendants for: (1) paying CC-OG's attorneys' fees, costs, and/or expenses in defending against Plaintiffs' claims for damages contained in the COMPLAINT filed in their civil action; (2) paying CC-OG's ordered amount of monetary damages awarded to Plaintiffs in their civil action against Defendants, including against CC-OG; (3) paying CC-OG's attorneys' fees, costs, and/or expenses in relation to bringing forth the instant Cross-Complaint against Cross-Defendants herein; and (4) for such further relief as the Court deems proper and necessary;
2. As to the Second Cause of Action for judgment in favor of CC-OGs and against Cross-Defendants and award CC-OGs relief by granting indemnification to CC-OG from Cross-Defendants for: (1) paying CC-OG's attorneys' fees, costs, and/or expenses in defending against Plaintiffs' claims for damages contained in the COMPLAINT filed in their civil action; (2) paying CC-OG's ordered amount of monetary damages awarded to Plaintiffs in their civil action against Defendants, including against CC-OG; (3) paying CC-OG's attorneys' fees, costs, and/or expenses in relation to bringing forth the instant Cross-Complaint against Cross-Defendants herein; and (4) for such further relief as the Court deems proper and necessary; and
3. As to the Third Cause of Action for judgment in favor of CC-OGs and against Cross-Defendant and award CC-OGs relief by granting declaratory relief and declaring that: (1) Cross-Defendants shall be solely responsible for paying CC-OG's attorneys' fees, costs, and/or expenses in defending against Plaintiffs' claims for damages contained in the COMPLAINT filed in their civil action; (2) Cross-Defendants shall be solely responsible for paying the entire ordered amount of monetary damages awarded to Plaintiffs in their civil action against Defendants; (3) Cross-Defendants shall be solely responsible for paying CC-OG's attorneys' fees, costs, and/or expenses in relation to

bringing forth the instant Cross-Complaint against Cross-Defendants herein; and (4)
for such further relief as the Court deems proper and necessary.

///

///

DATED: October 20, 2023

WADE LAW GROUP, APC

Jonathan Goldstein

JONATHAN A. GOLDSTEIN, ESQ.

Attorney for Defendant/Cross-Complainant,
OFFICER GACAD, in his
individual capacity

Certification and Closing

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11, by signing below, I certify to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief that this cross-complaint: (1) is not being presented for an improper purpose, such as to harass, cause unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of litigation; (2) is supported by existing law or by a nonfrivolous argument for extending, modifying, or reversing existing law; (3) the factual contentions have evidentiary support or, if specifically so identified, will likely have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation or discovery; and (4) the answer otherwise complies with the requirements of Rule 11.

I agree to provide the Clerk's Office with any changes to my address where case related papers may be served. I understand that my failure to keep a current address on file with the Clerk's Office may result in the dismissal of my case.

Date of signing: 10 / 20 / 2023

Signature of Defendant 

Printed Name of Defendant Lawrence Gacad